

14

**REPORT**  
OF  
**A SELECT COMMITTEE**  
OF THE  
**COMMONS HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**  
OF  
**UPPER CANADA**  
ON THE SUBJECT OF  
**GOVERNMENT GRANTS**  
MADE TO CERTAIN  
**RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS**  
IN THE  
**PROVINCE,**  
AND THE PURPOSES TO WHICH SUCH GRANTS ARE APPLIED.



2,000 COPIES PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Toronto :

M. REYNOLDS, PRINTER.

1886.

B.  
1836  
16  
PL  
CCDD

# REPORT

OF

## SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

### RELIGIOUS GRANTS.

#### TO THE HONORABLE THE COMMONS HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

The Committee appointed by your Honorable House to inquire whether any money has been paid by the Government to any religious denominations in this Province, and if so, what the purposes are to which such grants (if any) have been applied; and that the said committee have authority to summon witnesses and call for the production of papers and records, and to report from time to time by Address or otherwise—

#### *Beg leave to Report as follows:*

That in pursuance to the order of your Honorable House your committee proceeded to the consideration of the first subject of inquiry, namely, "whether any money has been paid by the Government to any Religious denominations in this Province."

Upon referring to official returns laid before your Honorable House, during the last Session of Parliament, it appears that certain sums of money have been paid from the revenue of the Province to the following denominations, viz:—

The Church of England,  
The Roman Catholic Church,  
The Established Church of Scotland,  
The United Presbyterian Synod,  
The British Wesleyan Conference, or the Wesleyan Methodist Society,  
The Canadian Wesleyan Conference.

The fact that Grants have been made and received by the above denominations is sufficiently established by the correspondence between the Secretary of his Excellency the Lieut. Governor, and the parties concerned, together with the Receiver General's account of the expenditure of the casual and territorial revenue, all of which documents are amongst the records of your Honorable House.

Had there been nothing further required than a knowledge of the fact, that sums of money had been granted to certain religious bodies, our inquiry might have here rested, but your committee was desirous of ascertaining the full extent of the question, whether the grants so made were to such religious bodies "in this Province."

There was no question in the mind of your committee as to the full application of this understanding to most of the religious denominations mentioned, and indeed it was but to one of them that doubts existed as to such application.

Some few years have now elapsed since these grants were first made, and a feeling corresponding with the anticipated effects has very generally pervaded the Province. That feeling must exist and indeed increase,

as long as the cause which gives rise to it is continued; that such a feeling should not be exercised towards that body of christians to which we have last alluded, were devoutly to be wished. The remembrance of past years, when with a single eye their whole powers of mind and body were used for the welfare of their fellow subjects, in ameliorating their moral and civil condition; standing forth as the champions of civil and religious liberty; braving the persecutions of their enemies; enduring with patience, fatigue and privation; and living in the affections of their numerous friends, is not easily erased.

Your committee, however anxious to wipe away the stain from them, felt bound to pursue their course, straight-forward, and though the result of their inquiry might fix upon that body the broad mark of public disapprobation, they, nevertheless, as public servants, were bound to the performance of their duty.

Your committee submit to your Honorable House the evidence together with such other appended documents as they have been able to obtain, and to which reference will be made in the course of this Report.

The question now under consideration and to which the inquiry of your committee has been principally directed, is, whether the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Canada has participated in grants of public money.

The first grant from the Government of £900 s't'g. was made according to the communication from Lieut. Col. Rowan, to the "British Wesleyan Conference" and was paid by the Receiver General to "Thos. G. Ridout, Esq. Cashier of the Bank of Upper Canada" to be placed to the credit of Messrs. Haslop and "Marsden," who were Treasurers of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Committee. This grant was not made therefore to the Methodist Conference at that time in existence in this Province.

That this grant of money was not originally intended for the "Canadian Conference," is evident from the testimony of Mr. Alder, given before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1828, to the question, "Do you conceive that the Colonial Government in Upper Canada has manifested any desire for the extension of the British Wesleyan Methodists in that Province?"—he answered "I believe there are documents in the Colonial Office addressed to Earl Bathurst and to Mr. Huskisson from Sir Peregrine Maitland which will show that His Excellency is very anxious that the number of British Methodist Ministers should be increased as far as possible in Upper Canada; and I understand that he wrote home a short time ago recommending that pecuniary aid might be allowed us for that purpose."

183

16

2

61

61

61

the

for

de

Ma

of

in

tin

de

wi

yo

fer

ore

the

on

the

ere

do

"

"

"

con

the

cer

cog

to

eco

But in October 1833, subsequent to the making of the grant, a union was ratified between the two Conferences (a copy of the articles of which are appended to this report;) and the money was paid to Mr. Marsden while he was in this Province, he being one of the Treasurers of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London and President of the Conference then sitting or which had sat in York, U. C.

From the terms of the union, together with the evidence and other documents appended hereto, together with such others as are already in the possession of your Hon. House, the relation between the two Conferences appears to be of such a nature that more than ordinary skill is required to show how imputation in the matter of the grant in question can attach itself to one as principal and not to the other as accessory, in the strictest sense.

In the preface to the articles of union, it is considered that the concurrence of the two bodies to "the doctrines of Methodism" "as contained in the notes of "Mr. Wesley on the New Testament, and in his four "volumes of sermons," a principal reason for their connexion, (this is important when it is considered that the condition contained in the deed enrolled in Chancery, by which the Conference at home is legally recognized, is, that it shall as such Conference adhere to these doctrines.)

In the second article it is stated that the discipline, economy and form of church government in general, of the Wesleyan Methodists in England, be introduced into the societies in Upper Canada."

In the 3rd article, "the usages of the English Conference, in reference to the probation, examination and admission of candidates into the Itinerant Ministry" were to be adopted.

In the fifth article the English Conference reserves the "authority to send, from year to year, one of its "own body to preside over the Canadian Conference."

That though in the 6th article the missions of Upper Canada are to be regarded as Missions of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society, yet by the third section or regulation of the same article "the Missionaries are to be stationed at the Canada Conference, in the same way as the other Preachers," the General Superintendent of Missions being connected with the stationing committee for such purpose.

The distributing of the sum determined by the Parent Society in London to be applied for the support and extension of the Missions is made according to the 1st section of the 6th article and the evidence, to be by the Canada Conference Committee.

It appears by evidence, that the union prevented the formation or continuance of Societies in this Province, by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England and attached those already formed to the Canada Conference.

In an extract from the report of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (London) it is said that the grant of £900 (Sterling) made by His Excellency the Lieut. Governor of this Province, was in aid of the expenditure of said Society for the support and extension of the missions among the Indian tribes, and in promoting Scriptural education among the settlers of the new Townships of this territory; and the ministers to this work, according to the 6th article of the union and evidence are appointed by the Canada Conference.

By evidence it appears that there is a union between the two bodies in doctrine, conditions of membership, or in the general rules—in church fellowship or communion, and one church receiving and recognizing the members of the other as members reciprocally.

That the missionaries appointed to the several missions and who are paid from the funds to which public grants have been applied and whose allowances are made under the authority of the Canada Conference, stand in the same relation to the Conference as other ministers in reference to their probation, examination and admission, with privileges and allowances as such members of Conference.

That the superintendent of missions in the Province who is appointed (and consequently removable) by the English Conference, and paid by the Parent Missionary Committee, is a member of the Canadian Conference, and accountable to it for his moral and religious conduct.

In addition to the above it may be remarked, that there is evidently a very different feeling existing between the two bodies now, than formerly existed, that is before the union.—According to documents appended to this Report it appears, that during the connexion of the Conference in Canada with the General Conference in the United States, an understanding existed between the English & American Conferences, that the former should wholly confine its labors to Lower Canada, with the exception of retaining its mission already established in Kingston; and that the principle that "the Wesleyan Methodists are one in every part of the world" maintained by the Board of Missions of the Canada Conference, in a series of resolutions condemnatory of the establishment of missions in this Province by the English Conference as being an infringement of the above understanding—was explained by the Missionary Committee in England in reply, as being "only applicable in the sense of fraternal affection," and which reply consisting of a series of resolutions, contained very severe censures on the manner in which the Christian Guardian was published, as engaging in the local politics of the Province, thereby creating prejudice against the acceptableness of the Canada Preachers with a part of the population of Canada.

This expression of opinion in connexion with evidence has certainly placed this publication in a very singular position; it was denounced as being a political engine, and the cause of prejudice against the acceptableness of the Canadian Preachers;—that in the event of a union it would be required to be divested of its political character;—in the session of Conference in which the union between the Canada and English Conferences was ratified, and at which Mr. Marsden, representative of the British Conference, presided, a vote was passed, approving of the manner in which the Guardian had been conducted the previous year, altho' its policy had been the same as before the above denunciation, and the editor had been warmly engaged during the time in a controversy with a Wesleyan Minister on the subject of the Government grants, condemning the same; that the same publication is at present following a course opposite to that it pursued when the above vote was taken, and that it is not divested of its political character as required, but its political character is changed, and that it exerts a political influence very different since the union to what it did before.



The extract from the instructions to the delegate who went to England shew the determination of the Conference itself to confine the Guardian wholly to subjects of a religious character, and whatever may be said in extenuation, sufficient proof is elicited to show the effects of its publications.

Your committee conceive that what has been already said upon the relation existing between the two Conference, so far as relates to imputation between principal and accessory in respect to Government grants, the case is sufficiently clear; and they are of opinion with the evidence, that though one may receive directly and the other indirectly, still in their effects there is little or no difference.

The proofs are still stronger, if possible, which relate to some of the particulars of the second grant, in establishing the point, that it was made to be expended "in this Province."—The letter from the Lieutenant Governor's Secretary announcing this grant is addressed to the "Wesleyan Methodist Conference" the letter was enclosed to the Rev. James Richardson who had acted as Secretary at the last sitting of Conference. And it is said in evidence that the latter grant was evidently made for the purpose of being expended in the Province after the Canada Conference was connected with the English Conference.

Your committee are led to the conclusion from the nature of the evidence and other proof, that the Wesleyan Methodist Church or Conference in Upper Canada stands connected with public grants in a similar manner to the other denominations before mentioned.

And in conclusion to this part of their inquiry your committee would refer your Honorable House to the terms used in the letters announcing the grants, "Applications to His Majesty's Government from several religious denominations for assistance in the present state of the Province to enable them to build churches and chapels."—To the extract of a despatch from the Secretary of State to the Lieut. Governor,

Dated Downing Street, }  
27th Jan'y, 1834. }

"And concerning the heavy charges to which the casual revenue will for some years be subject, I am compelled to desire, that the grant in aid of the erection of dissenting places of worship shall continue to be £2,000, instead of £4,200."

And to the following extract from Sir F. B. Head's instructions:

"It appears that the four religious communities whose funds are aided by grants from the hereditary and territorial revenue are, those of the Churches of England and Scotland and Rome, and of the Wesleyan Methodist Society; the last being in two divisions, which respectively take the distinct appellation of the 'Canadian and the British.'"

Your committee cannot but understand that the latter term used in the last extract, has reference to the denomination under consideration; and in evidence it is said, that the term is sometimes so used.

Your committee having so far considered the first part of their inquiry proceed to the next, viz: What the purposes are to which such grants are applied.

From the accounts of the casual and territorial revenue for the years 1833, 1834 and 1835 it appears that certain sums of money were granted and applied as salaries and pensions [The pensions are to certain Missionaries and widows of Missionaries of the

Church of England]—to the ministers of various denominations, viz:—

The Church of England,

The Roman Catholic Church,

The Presbyterian Synod of Upper Canada in connexion with the Established Church of Scotland. And

The United Presbyterian Synod of Upper Canada.

Your committee are under no apprehension that the above grants of money will be diverted from their original application.

But other grants have been made to certain denominations to be applied "in aid of the erection of dissenting places of worship," or "to enable them to build churches and chapels."

Your committee are not warranted in substituting any other form of application to this species of grant than what the terms express; there is a specific tenure or condition in the giving and receiving the same, and a diversion from such mutual understanding is in the mind of your committee a violation of contract.

An exception may by possibility, and indeed has been taken from the latter part of the communication announcing the grant; the words are, "And I am to inform you, that on your stating the manner in which the grant is to be applied, His Excellency will order the amount to be placed at your disposal."

To suppose for a moment that this can mean any thing else than the application of the grant to the specific object mentioned, viz: to "enable them to build churches or chapels," were to charge the Government, yes the Government of Great Britain with duplicity, a double entendre, a charge repugnant to the feelings of every good and loyal subject.

A proper understanding of the application of the grant was had by the Roman Catholics, the Presbyterians, and the Canadian Wesleyan Methodists, as plainly appears by the returns made by those bodies to the Government Office, and sent down to this House.

The resolutions of the Canadian Wesleyan Conference are prospective, stating the manner in which the grant, if made, should be applied. By evidence it appears that the application of the grant was made in pursuance of those resolutions.

As no returns had been made of the application of the grant made to the other community of Methodists termed by Lord Glenelg "British."—Your committee have spared no pains to ascertain from the best sources of information what application was made by them of the sum granted.

The concurrent testimony, derived from the evidence and appended documents, goes to show that the money has been applied to Missionary purposes, or paid into the fund from which is defrayed the general expenses of the various missions.

There are several considerations which induce your committee to view such an application in a very reprehensible light.

1st. It is in fact a direct diversion of the grant from its original intent; there is an evident difference between applying the grant for the specific purpose of "building churches or chapels," and that of defraying the general expenses of the various mission stations,—and though the last term being so very general, may include an application of a portion of the grant to "chapels and school-houses," another portion must inevitably be applied to the payment of the Conference allowance to the Missionaries.

2d. These Missionaries though being in the same relation to the Canada Conference as other Preachers, must, your committee think, be more or less under the influence of the Conference or Missionary Committee in England, through the superintendent of missions who acts in behalf of that body receiving the grant.

3rd. Admitting such an influence to exist, which is certainly within the range of strong probability, your committee submit whether the incorporation of such persons into a body whose influence is well known in the general affairs, civil as well as religious, of the Province, has not a tendency to infuse those views in relation to the policy of Government which may be entertained by the body exercising that influence.

4th. The general superintendent of missions, who is paid from the funds into which this grant is placed, being a member of the Canada Conference, and a very prominent one, cannot be supposed to be without influence.

It appears by a return given in evidence, that the exact amount of the Government grants is accounted for. Whether this account is in accordance with the yearly reports of the Treasurer of the Missionary Society, and that published in the Christian Guardian, which are hereto appended, your committee cannot determine—the accounts, for one year (1835) in the report not being in detail,—and as respecting the form or manner of making out this account, they are equally at a loss to understand;—that the charges or entries are or are not correct in themselves, is not the question,—but why this account should be so framed as to show that no preachers but *natives* have received any portion of the grants from Government, your committee cannot comprehend. This manner of accounting for the expenditure of the grants is far from being satisfactory to the committee.

They would refer your honorable house to the accounts of the Treasurer appended hereto, together with evidence to shew that monies collected in this Province, from whatever source derived, including the amount received from the Parent Society, are put into one common stock or mission fund:—and that the “general expenses of the various mission stations” are paid from the same, and that the same accounts shew that others besides native teachers are paid from this general fund, for instance, the Rev. W. Case, Mr. Belton, Mr. McMullin, Mr. Adams, Mr. Messmore, Mr. Turner; Mr. Hurlburt and Mr. Johnson, whom your committee apprehend are not *native* Preachers or Teachers, and those persons or the greater part, your committee believe are members of the conference, and as well might the names of the persons above mentioned have been returned as receiving a portion of the grants, and the native Preachers, Exhorters and others left out; for all who are paid from the mission fund must inevitably receive a portion of the Government grant as well as of other monies constituting that fund.

But the effects these grants have had upon the public mind are but too well known to need their particular description to your honorable house.

The Canadian Wesleyan conference negated a resolution brought before it on the subject of receiving grants, as they proved the cause of greatly diminishing their congregations, of curtailing very materially the liberality of their friends, and of creating disquietude and want of agreement among the members of the conference, in the application of the money.

It appears a motion in the form of a resolution was made in the Wesleyan Methodist conference in the years 1834 and 1835, for an expression of the opinion of the conference on the subject of government grants; but the motion was lost. Such a proceeding creates astonishment when it is notoriously known that both the conference and its organ the Christian Guardian have heretofore expressed opinions so decidedly upon the subject. There is one consideration in connexion with these grants that should, your committee think, have induced the conference to consider the subject, and of which they were not ignorant, that the revenue from which these grants were made was considered by one branch of the Legislature as belonging to the Province, and indeed an expectation had been held out for some time that they would be fully ceded by the British government.

Whatever coloring may be given to the whole transaction, one thing is clear, that the grants of money have been made, whether they were made directly to the Canadian conference or not, and that the conference or the connexion have become a participator therein; and further, that the application of the grants have not been in accordance with their tenure or condition. As so much has been said on the manner in which the Seventh Report of the select committee on Grievances has expressed itself in relation to this subject your committee considered it just both to themselves and your honorable house who have adopted that Report, to obtain some expression of opinion thereon.—To this end they put a few questions to one of the witnesses whom it was believed would not deviate from the strictest principles of right: the answers to the questions Nos. 331, 332 and 333 need no particular comment.

In answer to the question “Is it your opinion that it is so erroneously false or injurious to your church as to call for the animadversion and allegations which have appeared in the Christian Guardian against the committee on Grievances and House of Assembly?” The witness says “I think not, as I consider its statements not so much at variance with the fact, of monies having been received from Government and expended on the missions connected with the conference to which I belong, as the means or channel through which they have been received and applied to said missions. I have been both grieved and surprised at the many severe and indiscriminate censures which have appeared against the Committee on Grievances because of what they have said in the Report respecting the Methodists, as I am of opinion that a few explanations and corrections made in the spirit of candor and meekness, would have been sufficient to remove any injurious impressions arising from the errors in the report; and also thereby this unpleasant and laborious inquiry might have been uncalled for.”

The above, together with the previous answer are, your committee think, a complete refutation to all the vituperation and slander that has been penned on the subject.

Your committee regret that it was considered by the Methodist body expedient to have in any manner countenanced grants of public money, even for the purpose of extending their missions among the Indians. There appears to have been a time within the history of the Province when, instead of being aided by Government, they were laboring under persecution and the character of their ministers vilified and tra-

duced by those whose connexion with the Executive were well known. But notwithstanding this, their labors were a blessing to the Province generally and to the Indians in particular. The following extract from the report of a select committee of your honorable house on the petition of christians of different denominations, in the year 1828, is an honorable testimony of their labours:—"The great and surprising change which has occurred within a short period of time in the character and condition of large bodies of the Mississagua Indians, is well known, from a state of vice and ignorance, wretchedness and degradation—almost brutal, they have been brought to habits of industry, order and temperance, a thirst for instruction & knowledge, a profession of the christian religion, and apparently a cordial and humble belief of its truth and enjoyment of its blessings.

"In this change the Methodists have been chiefly instrumental. They have manifested the most benevolent zeal in accomplishing it; they have sent Missionaries and established Schools among them which are supported by voluntary contributions, and they are still laboring among them with the same disinterested spirit and the same surprising encouragement and success."

In confirmation of the above your Committee would refer to the following evidence given before the same Committee by a prominent Member of the Conference; in speaking of the labours of the first Missionaries to this Province, he says, "From this time the Church began to spread in different settlements, which altho' for the most part small and separated at a considerable distance, yet were regularly visited by the preachers, who in travelling from the one to the other, were under the necessity of following the Indian paths, or marked trees through the woods for many miles without meeting with a white inhabitant, and of fording or swimming rivers and creeks, in some instances at the peril of their lives, being sometimes thrown from their horses and compelled to save themselves by swimming, or if they could not swim by getting on logs, or catching hold of branches of trees, and thus drawing themselves to land; in several instances passing the night in the Indian Wigwam, or even in the open air, with no other covering than the canopy of heaven."

"But notwithstanding all these difficulties and discouragements, these faithful Ministers of Christ, and their successors with no other means of subsistence than the voluntary contributions of the people, who being at that time for the most part poor, and newly settled on their farms, were able to do but little for the support of their preachers, have continued to persevere in their labors until the present time, at a considerable sacrifice of property, and in several instances, of life; looking for no other reward than the testimony of a good conscience, the gratitude and affection of the people, the approbation of their God and the pleasure of seeing the cause of God prosper and prevail. The result of their labors and sufferings has been the eternal salvation of many, who have died in the triumphs of the faith of the Gospel, the establishment of numerous societies in almost every part of the country, and the conversion of several hundreds of Indians from the most wretched state of intemperance and debauchery to a state of sobriety of virtue and to God."

B

Your committee cannot but observe the almost universal testimony borne to the useful labors of the ministry and the loyalty of both Preachers and members of the Methodist church, in the evidence to the report referred to. This is mentioned with a view to repel the insinuation contained in the evidence of Mr. Alder before the committee of the House of Commons, whose Report is dated the same year as that of the committee of your honorable house.

The evidence of Mr. Alder, hereto appended (marked K) will shew the views taken by the conference in England in reference to the Clergy Reserves in Canada, the necessity of introducing Preachers from the British conference and the relation they hold to the church of England.

From the despatches relative to religious grants sent down by His Excellency and which have been referred to your committee, it appears that the Secretary of State, Lord Aberdeen, in his despatch of 22d Feb. 1835, has authorised salaries to six Presbyterian ministers of £57 each, independently of £1,000 already enjoyed by the Synod; and an additional sum of £350 to the annual grant of the Scotch church.

The late period at which these documents have been sent down, preclude the possibility of making that use of them as would be wished, but they cannot close their Report without noticing that their understanding of the intention of his Majesty's government in the application of the grants, is fully confirmed in the following extract from Viscount Goderich's despatch of date 25th Oct. 1832:

"With this view I am to request that you will transmit to me at the beginning of each year a statement of the mode in which you would propose that the money which it is intended to apply to religious purposes should be distributed, and in preparing such a scheme you will of course bear in mind the principles on which you have already been directed to act, namely, that you will endeavour to give assistance to the religious denominations as much as possible, by building for them in situations where they can command congregations, chapels and parsonage houses, as I am of opinion that money may be much more advantageously applied to these objects than in paying salaries."

And that the Grants were made to the Wesleyan Methodists in this Province by the despatch of the 12th Nov. 1832.

"I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch of the 5th Sept. last proposing an arrangement for the payment of the Church of England Missionaries in the province of Upper Canada, and for affording aid to the Presbyterians, Wesleyan Methodists and Roman Catholics to build churches and chapels."

Your committee in closing their Report cannot too decidedly express their conviction that grants of public money made to religious bodies, however specious and plausible may be their application, are productive of much evil. The history of the church but too plainly testifies that her connexion with the state, however faint or feeble in the commencement, has produced in its growth a corresponding severance from other dependance much more legitimate and infinitely better calculated to maintain the position she was designed to hold in the world.—And this province within some few years past has been made to witness much dissatisfaction, heart-burnings and contention;—Confidence in the Ministers of those Churches



## 6 Evidence to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

receiving grants has been weakened, and their personal disinterestedness questioned.

It was not practicable from the lateness of the session and the nature of the business, to which most of the committee had to attend in their places in your Hon. House, to enter more fully into the investigation of the subjects of their inquiry, but would recommend that it be renewed at the next session.

All which is most respectfully submitted.

THOMAS PARKE, CHAIRMAN.  
P. SHAYER, T. D. MORRISON,  
JOHN COOK, CALED HOPKINS,  
J. RYMAL, W. L. MACKENZIE,  
D. THORBURN.

Committee Room, 16th April, 1836.

### Minutes of Evidence.

#### MEMBERS—MEMBERS.

PARKE,	HOPKINS,
THORBURN,	SHAYER,
RYMAL,	COOK,
MORRISON,	MACKENZIE.
ROBLIN,	

Committee Room, Monday, }  
28th March, 1836. }

Committee met.

Mr. Parke was appointed Chairman.

#### REV. EPHRAIM EVANS, called in and Examined.

1. Are you a member of the Methodist Conference in this Province, formerly known as the conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada?—I am.

2. By what title is said conference now distinguished?—The Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

3. How long has the church to which you belong had the title of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada?—It was formerly called the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, in October, 1833 it was named the Wesleyan Methodist Church in British North America, and in 1834, it received its present title.

4. Is that since the Union with the British Conference?—Yes.

5. Is there another body of Methodists in the Province called Wesleyan Methodists?—I believe there is a body called the "Canadian Wesleyan Methodists" they may be called Wesleyan Methodists in some places.

6. Are not the Preachers and members of your church sometimes called British Wesleyans, in distinction from the Canadian Wesleyans?—I cannot tell that they are, it may be the case; but they are not so known officially.

7. Do the church to which you belong, and the Wesleyan Methodists in England form but one body or are they two distinct churches?—The Methodist body in this country is perfectly distinct in some respects from the Methodist body in England, the two bodies are in friendly connexion with each other.

8. In what respects are they the same, and how are they distinct?—The same in doctrine and discipline.—The Wesleyan Methodist conference in England exercises no pastoral or disciplinary control over our societies, nor our conference over theirs.

9. Did the conference in England acknowledge your conference as a branch of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion when you were called the Methodist Episcopal church, and treat with you accordingly?—I do not understand the purport of the question, and therefore cannot answer it; I do not understand what is meant by the conference in England acknowledging our conference as a branch of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion, or what is meant by their treating with us accordingly.—the Wesleyan Methodist conference in England admitted while treating with us, that we were the same in doctrine and therefore could treat with us accordingly, in that sense they consider us as springing from the same stock.

10. Did they not consult with your conference or your superintendent when you were called the Methodist Episcopal Church about establishing their missions or forming

societies of their own in this Province?—Mr. Alder, from the Missionary board in London had a consultation with the Missionary board in this place, and afterwards with the conference on the subject.—There was some previous communication on the subject between the Missionary board in London through the Secretary, Mr. Townley, and the missionary board in this country.

11. What mission stations had they in the Province at the time the Union was formed?—One in Kingston, one in Toronto, and one at St. Clair.

12. On whose part were proposals for Union first made, and what proceedings were had thereon till it was finally ratified?—The first proposal for Union was from us to the British Conference,—the Canada Conference appointed a delegate to proceed to England to treat with the British Conference, and on the receipt of the terms agreed to by the British Conference and our delegate, they were acceded to by us and the union was ratified.

13. Did Mr. Alder make any stipulations on the part of his conference as conditions of the proposed union?—He had no authority to do so and consequently did not,—in conversation in conference he stated what he thought that the British conference would accede to as the terms of the Union.

14. What were those stipulations? or what did Mr. Alder say the conference would accede to?—He stated that in his opinion it would be necessary that the Episcopal form of Church Government should be changed for that of an annual Presidency, the President to be appointed by the British Wesleyan Conference as often as they should think proper; that the usages of the British Conference should be adopted in the admission of candidates for the ministry; that district meetings should be established as in England—that the mission work should be put under the direction of the Wesleyan Missionary committee in London;—that in order to the effectually uniting the two Methodist societies in Kingston, the British Conference should for a time have the right of appointing a Preacher to that town; and that as far as practicable the discipline and usages of the British Wesleyan connexion should be introduced into our societies in this Province—he stated further, as nearly as I can recollect, that an unfavourable opinion was entertained in England, and in Lower Canada, in consequence of an impression that the *Christian Guardian*, the official organ of our Conference, was political in its character, that the Wesleyan conference and societies in England had ever considered it their duty to remain unidentified with any political party, and to avoid political discussion except in self-defence, that on this account it would be necessary that the *Christian Guardian* should become strictly religious in its character, and keep aloof from political interference, except when the privileges or character of the church should be invaded, as unless this were done, it would be impossible to obtain the assent of the Preachers either in England or Lower Canada to the union, and he therefore recommended "that our delegate should be instructed to assure "the committee that the *Christian Guardian* should assume "a decidedly religious character for the future."

Committee met.

Tuesday, 29th March, 1836.

#### REV. EPHRAIM EVANS, again called in and examined.

15. Were these the confidential communications made by Mr. Alder to your conference, or did he make others that were confidential?—If there had been confidential I should not have stated them; he made some confidential communications which are not stated—they have however no reference to Government grants or financial regulations whatever.

16. Are the confidential communications in their character purely religious or altogether political?—They were not at all political in their character, not in the most remote degree.

17. Did the communications in any way relate to the political character of the Methodist body—or to that of any of the conference, or to any publication under the authority of the Conference?—No they did not.

18. If they (the communications) were purely religious and not at all political, why are they confidential?—Mr.

Mr. Alder, from  
tion with the  
ards with the  
revious com-  
in London  
in missionary

Province at  
Kingston, one

on first made,  
it was finally  
s from on to  
ere appointed  
at with the  
f the terms  
delegate, they  
fined.

on the part of  
union?—He  
did not,—in  
thought that  
terms of the

did Mr. Alder  
stated that the  
Episcopal  
for that of  
ointed by the  
should think  
re should  
in aid in  
England—  
direction of  
on;—that in  
dist societies  
a time have  
ing; and that  
of the Br-  
into our so-  
early as I  
entertained  
gence of an  
ficial organ  
fer, that the  
and had ever  
with any per-  
except in  
cessary that  
religious in-  
fluence, ex-  
tuch should  
be impossi-  
in England  
fere recom-  
to assure  
ould assume

ch, 1836

and examined.  
ations made  
others that  
iel I should  
all commu-  
no re-  
regulations  
their charac-  
They were  
not remote

to the po-  
that of any  
e authority

y religious  
tial?—Mr.

Alder himself could answer that question better than I can; on my part they are confidential, because communicated as such.

10. Were they (the communicant ones) made to you solely or before you in the Conference by Mr. Alder?—They were the subject of private communication between myself and Mr. Alder, and I dare say between him and other members of the Conference;—they were also stated in conference.

20. Are you aware that a member of your Conference has made these communications public, not considering them confidential?—I never heard that a member of conference had communicated them until I heard it yesterday from Dr. Morrison.

21. Was not a member of your conference either privately or publicly advertised on for having made them public?—Never to my knowledge.

22. Have you never heard that these communications were known by other persons not members of your conference?—I have never until yesterday, as before stated.

23. Have you then always supposed, till Dr. Morrison divulged the contrary, that these communicant ones were secret?—I have always entertained so high an esteem for my Ministerial brethren as to suppose they would not reveal these confidential communications.

24. Is it not possible that some members of your Conference differ with you as to these communications being confidential?—I should think it very improbable.

25. Was a vote of your Conference passed enjoining secrecy on its members as to these communications?—No;—we have too much confidence in each others' probity to think such a vote necessary.

26. Would it be a breach of probity in your members to divulge any communications that they might think necessary to be publicly known?—I think from the nature of those communications no member of the Conference could think it necessary that they should be publicly known.

27. Do the members of your Conference enjoy freedom of judgement?—If they do, may they not be allowed to differ with you in opinion as to those communications being confidential with impunity?—The members of our Conference enjoy freedom of judgement, I think however that every honorable and christian principle would forbid their considering these communications as not strictly confidential, when they were made as such, especially as the divulging of them could in no wise promote the public weal, nor the refusing to do so be at all detrimental to it.

28. Does any christian principle forbid any member of your conference from making public that that may have been communicated to him in confidence when he gave no pledge to that effect, or no obligation of secrecy was enjoined on him, if he thought that it was necessary to the welfare of the church, and of the world to make it public? Christian principle forbids any man doing evil that good may come.

29. Did you pledge yourself to secrecy to Mr. Alder or did any member of your Conference pledge himself to secrecy or was secrecy enjoined on the members of your Conference by a vote of the Conference when or after Mr. Alder made these communications?—I am not aware that any person ever gave a direct pledge to secrecy to Mr. Alder but as I stated before, as no good could result from their publication, I consider the confidential manner in which they were communicated sufficient to render them perfectly confidential.

30. Who was it made the confidential injunction, and what was its nature to render it an obligation of secrecy?—Mr. Alder was the person as stated before, who made the communications confidential. In my opinion the obligation of secrecy rests upon the implicit confidence reposed by that gentleman in the honorable and christian character and feelings of those to whom they were communicated.

31. Do you mean to say that any member of your Conference who may have divulged these communications has sacrificed his christian character?—I am not aware that any member of Conference has communicated them as I said before;—the question assumes a case of the existence of which I have no knowledge.

32. Have you not assumed that if a member of Conference, for instance yourself, had divulged these communications he would have been guilty of a want of probity. Is not this a case?—I perhaps do not fully understand the question. It implies that even a case is assumed in my replies to former questions, those replies are before the committee to make what use of them they may think proper.

33. Have you not assumed that the communications made by Mr. Alder above alluded to were confidentially made to the Conference;—heretofore to be confidentially kept by them, and have you not assumed that secrecy in the members rested on their christian character and feeling, consequently if they divulge them (in your opinion) are they not guilty of a sacrifice of christian character and feeling?—I refer the committee to my former replies for an answer to this question, as it seems to be founded solely upon them. Should such a case ever come before the conference, which I think is very improbable, I shall then and there pass my judgment.

34. Does not your evidence on the principle of moral obligation on the part of the members of your conference to observe secrecy in relation to Mr. Alder's communications wholly rest on your own opinion?—and if any of your brethren differ with you in opinion, does it therefore make them guilty of a breach of "honor, christian character, feeling, and principle"?—My evidence is before the committee and they can judge upon what it rests.—As I have said before this question assumes the existence of a difference of opinion of which I have no knowledge, and the existence of which I think exceedingly improbable, I do not therefore feel disposed to pass my judgment on such supposed cases.

35. Did your Conference send Mr. Egerton Ryerson to England to negotiate with the British Conference relative to the Union?—They did.

36. Who was appointed Editor of the Guardian at the conference of 1832, or when the union was proposed?—The Rev. Mr. Richardson.

37. Was Mr. Richardson's appointment in consequence of Mr. Ryerson refusing to serve that year?—I think he was appointed because Mr. Ryerson had to go to England.

38. During the discussion of the union question, were expectations raised on the part of the members of your conference to share in the funds of the British connexion, should the union be effected?—I expected, as has been realized, that a part of the missionary funds of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion in England would be devoted to the benefit of the Indian tribes and destitute settlements; there are other funds belonging to the connexion in England in which we could not expect to share.

39. From what source have you derived your information that the missionary funds alone of the British Conference were expected to be shared by your conference?—From the discussion which took place I was never led to expect that any other than the missionary funds would be available by our conference.

40. Do you mean to be understood to say that the funds of the missionary society were to be applicable to the uses of the conference in this Province?—I understood that part of the funds of the missionary society in England would be devoted to the religious and moral instruction of the Indians and destitute settlers in this Province.

41. In your reply to question 39 you say "from the discussion that took place I was never led to expect that any other than those of the missionary funds would be available by our conference"; when and where did such discussion take place?—At the conference at Hallowell in 1832.

42. At that conference was there not a discussion about other funds than the missionary funds, and what was the general nature of that discussion?—A good deal of conversation took place in conference on the general financial system of the Wesleyan connexion in England, but nothing in that conversation ever led me to expect that we should have any claim on any other than the mission funds, nor do I believe that the conference was in any way influenced by expectations of pecuniary gain in consummating the union,

## 8 Evidence to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

43. Was the conversation you allude to merely ordinary conversational proceeding, or did it take place in conference when in regular session, or was it any thing like debate?—It was strictly a conversation and took place in conference in regular session, it was not a debate.

44. Is that the general and regular mode of proceeding in your conference?—It is, on some points, some subjects require Resolutions to be proposed and discussed.

45. Do you suppose or do you know that all, many, or very few of the members of your conference entertained the same opinions as yourself on the subject of the funds of the British conference and the conversation that took place on the subject in the conference in question?—I cannot say what the views of others are. I have given my own in my former replies.

46. Did many, all, or very few of the members of the Conference, on the occasion of the circumstances to which allusion is made, express any or no opinions on the subject?—I cannot say how many spoke on the subject, as I believe there are no documents in existence to which reference can be had. I beg to decline answering any more questions on the subject of that conversation.

47. Do you think that it is not possible for you, without documents to tell the Committee what appeared to be the general feeling and understanding of the Conference on that subject?—I cannot form an opinion of the feelings of others; but as nothing transpired while I was present in the Conference to raise such an expectation in my mind, I cannot conjecture why it should be supposed that other members of the Conference should come to a different conclusion.

48. Did you believe that the general character of the conversation in Conference in question was such in your opinion as to leave no doubt that they could not form any other opinion than the one you have come to on the subject of these funds?—I cannot reply directly to this question, as my judgement is not a guide for that of others.

49. Might it not be possible therefore that you may be mistaken as to the expectations of the Conference in regard to these funds?—I have no opinion respecting the expectations of Conference on the subject: I have only given my own views.

50. Is it your impression that from the nature of the conversation mentioned that the Conference had no right to expect a participation in these funds?—I refer to my former replies.

51. Were expectations raised in your Conference of a claim on the funds of the British Conference or of a donation from them?—No such expectations were raised in my mind.

52. Have you not acted in the capacity of assistant Secretary to the Conference; do you not think from filling that office, and your taking a general interest in its affairs, that you would be well acquainted with any understanding of the Conference whether on record or not, on this or any others object, if it were the matter of conversation before the Conference?—I was not assisting Secretary of the Conference that year.

53. Was Mr. Ryerson instructed to make any arrangement relative to appropriations from the British Conference to yours?—Not to my knowledge, unless the appropriation for the mission work be referred to in the question. In corroboration of these views, I beg to refer to the following extract from the instructions drawn up for the guidance of our delegate and which extract contains all that the instructions direct on the subject. "He shall use his best exertions to obtain as large an amount of pecuniary aid as possible to extend the work of God, amongst the white people and the Indian tribes."

54. Have you any knowledge of certain grants from government to aid the Methodist Church in this Province, if so, please state what you know concerning them?—I decline answering that question in the form in which it is put.

55. Was any intimation given to your Conference of the tender of any grant by government to the Methodists in this Province either before the union or since?—I cannot answer the question in that form, it does not refer to any particular church.

56. Do you not understand the question as far as it applies to your own Conference?—I do not understand the question.

57. Have you any knowledge at all or facts which you can submit to this committee of Government Grants to your Conference, or if they have received any or whether such Grants have been made and to what purpose have they been applied?—No Grants from the Government have been made to our Conference.

58. Was no report made to your Conference of the reception of such Grants by the superintendent of Missions?—I have no recollection of any report being made by the superintendent of Missions to conference on the subject of such Grants, I have understood that such a Grant has been received by the superintendent of Missions on behalf of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London.

59. Are you aware of the authority under which such Grants have been made, whether by the authority of His Majesty's Government or the Executive Government of this Province?—I cannot tell by whose authority the Grants were originally authorised, whether by His Majesty's Government or the Executive Government of this Province.

60. Have you not seen the published account of the receipt and expenditure of what is termed the casual and territorial revenue for the years 1833 and 1834, in which it is stated by the Government that the amounts paid to Messrs. Haslop and Marsden and Mr. Stinson was the amount authorised by His Majesty's Government to be expended in building Wesleyan Methodist Chapels in Upper Canada?—I have seen such a statement in the seventh Report of the Committee on Grievances; I cannot however rely on the correctness of that statement.

61. If you put no confidence in the seventh Report of the select committee on Grievances, would you do so in the published account of the Government in the Journals of the House of Assembly?—Yes I can put confidence in the latter document.

62. Do you admit that the amounts paid by the Government out of what is called the Crown fund, as published in the Journals of the House of Assembly to Messrs. Haslop and Marsden for missionary purposes was the sum authorised by His Majesty's Government to be expended in building Wesleyan Methodist Chapels in this Province?—I have understood from the Rev Joseph Stinson that on being informed by a communication from Colonel Rowan that the sum of £550 was placed at the disposal of the British Wesleyan Conference and that it would be paid over on His Excellency being informed to what uses it would be appropriated, he (Mr. Stinson) as the representative of the British Wesleyan Conference and general Superintendent of Wesleyan Missions in this Province, informed His Excellency by letter that it would be expended in erecting and repairing chapels and schoolhouses in this Province and in defraying the general expenses of the Mission stations under his charge. These documents can perhaps be procured at the Government Office—I do not know out of what fund it was paid.—It might be the Crown fund.

63. Was the Conference of which you are a member, ever known by the name of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference?—It never bore that name.

64. May not your conference have been called the British Wesleyan Conference in contradistinction to the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Conference?—They have never acknowledged that name, although it has been given to them in the Seventh Report of the select committee on Grievances.

65. Was not the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada once called the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in British North America?—Yes it was, it bore that name for about a year.

66. Was the union between the conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada strictly a union between that Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Society of Great Britain?—The union was more strictly between the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England and the

Conference of the until then Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, and it effected a union between the societies in so far as it prevented the formation or continuance of societies in this Province under the pastoral care of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England, and placed those already formed under the pastoral care of the conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

67. Is not the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England frequently called the British Wesleyan Conference to distinguish it from your conference in Canada?—I believe it is, I have often heard it so designated.

68. Was the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference formerly or ever the Episcopal Methodist Church?—It never was.

69. Was the Conference of which are a member formerly the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church?—It was until October, 1833.

70. Has any grant of money from the Government ever been made to or received by your Conference?—No, there has never been any such grant of money either offered to or received by our Conference.

71. Is the union between the Methodist Church in Canada and the Wesleyan Methodist Society in Great Britain such, that the members of the one are to be received by the members of the other, when removals take place from the one country to the other?—Yes, certainly.

72. In the seventh Report of the committee on Grievances, there are two items copied from the public accounts, bearing the signature of the Receiver General; in the first of which £1000 is said to be charged to Thomas Ridout, Esq., Cashier of the Bank of Upper Canada, to be paid to the credit of Messrs. Haslop and Marsden, for the missionary purposes of the Wesleyan Methodist Society, and in the other £911 2 2½ is said to have been paid to the Rev. Joseph Stinson, Representative of the Methodist missionary society in London, and Superintendent of Wesleyan missions in Upper Canada. Were those gentlemen authorised by the conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada or by the Missionary committee of that church to receive the said moneys, or did they receive them on account of the said church or committee in Canada?—Those gentlemen were never authorised either by the conference or the missionary committee of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada to receive those grants; nor were they received on account of that church. Messrs. Haslop and Marsden were joint treasurers of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London, at the time when the first grant of £1000 was made to that society, on whose account it was received and in whose annual report it is duly acknowledged. It was granted previously to the Union between the two conferences being proposed. The other sum was received by the Rev. Joseph Stinson as representative of the Methodist missionary society, London, as stated by the Receiver General in the accounts referred to in the question, and it is accounted for in the next annual report of that society. The conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada had nothing to do directly or indirectly in procuring those Grants, nor does an individual of that conference derive the least benefit from them. The Indians and destitute settlements are alone benefited by this liberality of His Majesty's Government.

I beg leave here to subjoin the following extract from the Report of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (London) for the year ending April, 1834.

"In consequence of the numerous openings for useful exertion in Upper Canada, six English Missionaries are about to proceed thither.—They will prosecute their labors under the patronage of this society and under the general direction of its committee, and of its representative in Upper Canada; but in fraternal and ecclesiastical union, also, with the Conference of that Province of which they are to be considered as regular members. In addition to such help as it may be deemed expedient that they should afford to the support and extension of the Missions among the Indian tribes, they will be specially employed in ministering 'evangelical instruction, and in promoting scriptural education among the settlers in the new townships of that rapidly increasing territory.—His Excellency the

"Lieutenant Governor of the Province, with an anxiety for the moral and religious improvement of the people placed under his care, highly honorable to a Christian ruler, and with a kindness of spirit and manner which claims the most grateful acknowledgements of the committee, has made the liberal grant of £20,000 to this society in aid of its expenditure, during the present year, for the purpose and objects above specified."

73. Is the union of the Wesleyan Methodist Church with the Wesleyan Methodist Society of Great Britain, a union in every respect constituting them one church?—They are not one Church in every respect—they are the same in the doctrines which they hold and inculcate—in the general rules of the societies under their care—and generally in the great features of their internal economy, and modes of operation; differing in the latter respects, however, according to the different circumstances of the two countries. Each however retains a distinct and proper independency,—neither conference having any right to exercise disciplinary control or ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the societies of the other, nor having any claim upon the funds or property of the other, excepting a portion of the Missionary funds as provided for in the articles of union.—The union has been effected on such principles as not at all to effect the identity of either body. The Wesleyan Conference in England is still regarded as the body enrolled in chancery by Mr. Wesley in his deed-poll; and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada is the same identical body formerly designated as successive periods, the Canada Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America,—the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada,—and the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in British North America.—The changes which have taken place from time to time in its name, form of government, and economy, have been effected in a manner authorised by its discipline."

74. To whom is the Rev. Joseph Stinson accountable for the monies which he receives for missionary purposes?—Only to the Missionary Committee in London, whom he represents in this Province.

75. Are they one church in their mutual privileges and liabilities?—I do not understand the question.

76. If the Wesleyan Methodist Society or connexion in Great Britain approves of Government Grants being made to their body either here or elsewhere—and the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada does not disapprove of the principle, they being in union, as a church with the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, are they (the former) accountable for it?—Neither society is accountable for the conduct of the other.

77. Have any of the Ministers of the Conference of which you are a member at any time derives any official pension from the public revenue raised within this Province, as stated in the Seventh Report of the Committee on Grievances?—I can say positively with reference to myself, that I have never received any such pension, nor do I believe that any of the ministers of the Conference to which I am connected have done so;—all assertions to the contrary, from whatever quarter, are without any foundation in truth.

78. You say that no individual member of your Conference derives the least support from the liberality of His Majesty's Government?—Are Messrs. Bolton & Mesmore not members of your conference, & if so have they not received monies out of the funds, you designate the liberality of His Majesty's Government?—I am not aware that either Mr. Bolton or Mr. Mesmore ever received any grants from the Government.—Whilst laboring as missionaries they derive their support entirely from the funds of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London. I am further of opinion, that when those gentlemen were appointed to the mission work they had no knowledge of any grants having been made to the Missionary Committee in London.

79. Who appointed them to the mission work?—The Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

80. Does the Conference pay any Preacher?—No.

81. Have you or any of the Clergy of the Methodist Church of which you are a member received at any time any gifts salaries, pensions, and retired allowances from the Government?—I can say positively with reference to myself, that I have never received any gift, salary, pension, or retired allowance from the Government, nor do I believe that any of the Ministers with whom I stand connected have done so as Ministers.—The 7th Report of the Select Committee on Grievances contains on this subject a palpable untruth; the tendency of which, if any credit were attached to it by the pious and moral portion of community, would be to injure the reputation of the Methodist Ministry, and might have a most painful effect upon the temporal comfort of the retired or superannuated preachers who receive no retired allowance from the Government,—but are supported by the voluntary contributions of the people.

82. Does the Conference receive any Preachers from the British Conference in England, if in full connexion, into full connexion in your conference?—Any preacher who is in full connexion in the British conference on removing into this country to labor as a minister would be received into full connexion in our conference.

83. From what source do such of the ministers of your church as are employed on missions receive their salaries?—Entirely from the funds of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London.

84. Do any of them receive an income from their congregation in addition to the salary received from the missionary committee?—None of them receive any such thing.—All contributions raised by the people under their care are accounted for to the missionary society.

85. Do any of them receive any additional salary in consequence of the grants made by the Government to the missionary committee in London?—I have before stated that they are not at all benefited by those grants, it is a fixed principle in the operations of the missionary committee, by whom they are paid, to pay the full disciplinary allowance to all their missionaries, and none of them can receive any additional salary.

86. Is there not a committee appointed at each Session of the Conference to which you belong for the purpose of apportioning the moneys, granted for Missionary purposes by the Missionary Committee in London?—There is in accordance with the regulation in the articles of Union between the English and Canada conferences as follows: "The parent committee in London shall determine the amount to be applied annually to the support and extension of the Missions, and this sum shall be distributed by a committee, consisting of the President, General Superintendent of the Missions, the Chairman of Districts, and seven other persons appointed by the Canada conference.—A standing board or committee consisting of an equal number of Preachers and Laymen shall moreover be appointed as heretofore, at every conference, which, during the year, shall have authority, in concurrence with the General Superintendent of Missions, to apply any moneys granted by the parent committee, and not distributed by the conference in establishing new Missions among the heathen, and otherwise promoting the Missionary work.

87. Has the committee appointed by your conference or has the conference itself any authority to control the missionary committee in London in regard to the means by which they shall raise money for carrying on the missionary work?—They have no such authority; the parent committee adopt such measures as they think proper to raise funds nor is the conference here aware of the sources from which the funds committed to it are raised until the publication of the subsequent report of the parent society.

88. Are Missionaries not considered either Ministers or Preachers?—Yes, certainly.

89. Who directs the movements of the Wesleyan missions in Upper Canada?—The missionaries are stationed by the Canada conference in the same way as the other preachers; with this proviso however that the general superintendent of missions shall be associated with the President and chairmen of districts, in their appointment.

--This arrangement is made because it is thought proper that the missionary committee in London who are represented by the superintendent of missions here, should have a voice in the appointment of the missionaries to their work; seeing that they receive from that committee the whole of their salary.

89. Did your conference institute an enquiry respecting government grants as to their design, application, &c. after it was known that they had been received by your President or Superintendent of missions?—There could be no necessity for instituting such an inquiry as the parent society alone is accountable for the receipts & disbursements of such money.

90. Was no motion made or proceedings had in conference relative to said grants?—I believe there was a motion made on the subject.

What were they and their results?—I do not recollect what the motion was, but it was discussed and lost.

92. Do you recollect the principle upon which the motion was lost?—I recollect that I opposed it upon the principle that the parent society was not accountable to us.

93. Are you not accountable for the principle of those grants although you are a branch or in union with the parent society?—I conceive that the parent society is alone accountable for its proceedings.

94. Do you not hold yourselves as a church at all accountable for any of the acts and principles of the parent society?—I know of no acts or principles of the parent society for which we are accountable.

95. Would you not be accountable or would you not feel yourselves accountable for any errors of doctrine, or any other erroneous principles of the parent society?—I do not consider that we should be accountable for any errors in doctrine or practice on the part of the parent society, as we have no disciplinary control over its proceedings.

96. If the Parent Society were entirely to depart from the principles and practices of Wesleyan Methodism would you not, while you remain in union with them, be accountable for such departure, unless you, in some way, avowed your dissent to such a proceeding; and would you not be looked upon in common with the Parent Society as no longer Wesleyan Methodists? Were the Parent Society to depart from any of the principles and practices of Wesleyan Methodism it would no longer exist as a Wesleyan Methodist Society, as the very existence of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion depends upon its adherence to the principles of the deep-pool enrolled in Chancery by Mr. Wesley; and as our connexion with the Wesleyan connexion in England depends upon our mutual adherence to the same principles, the connexion could no longer exist in the case supposed and we might still remain Wesleyan Methodists, and not be at all accountable for the errors of the Parent Society.

97. How came those grants to be made to the Missionary Society, when Mr. Secretary Rowan advised the Canadian Wesleyan conference that the sums of £600 sterling in 1833, and the sum of \$500, in 1834 was at the service of that conference to be applied in erecting churches and chapels? The \$600 sterling referred to in the question was granted to the conference of the Canadian Wesleyan Church, sometimes known as "Ryanites," not to the conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, of which I am a member. The \$500 in 1834 was granted to the British Wesleyan Conference, and it is said, perhaps, to have been granted to the Wesleyan Missionary Society, because the committee of the society has the control and expenditure of all the funds contributed from any quarter for the support of Wesleyan Missions.

98. Do the articles of union between your conference and the Parent Society contain any provision that will render that union null, if any occurrence, such as is before mentioned (in question 96,) should take place? The articles of union contain no such provision. It would, indeed, be altogether useless, because, as I remarked before, by such an occurrence the Parent Society would cease to exist.

99. If the Missionaries are paid by the Parent Society, what is done with the monies collected by your Auxiliary Societies in the Province for Missionary purposes? In accordance with one of the articles of union, all the monies raised by the Methodist Missionary Society in Upper Ca-



nada are paid into the funds of the Parent Society, or accounted for to that Society.

WEDNESDAY, 30th MARCH, 1836.

Committee met.

The Rev. Mr. RICHARDSON called in and examined.

100. Are you a member of the Methodist Conference in this Province, formerly known as the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada?—I am.

101. By what title is said Conference now distinguished?—The Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

102. How long has the church to which you belong had the title of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada?—Since 1834—it was one year previous, called the Wesleyan Methodist Church in British North America.

103. Is that since the union with the British Conference?—Since the union.

104. Is there another body of Methodists in the Province called Wesleyan Methodists?—There is another body called Canadian Wesleyan Methodists.

105. If the Methodist Conference of Great Britain had Societies in this Province would they not be denominated, Wesleyan Methodist Society?—I suppose they would.

106. Are there any such societies in the Province?—No; not distinct from ours that I know of.

107. Would it be considered right by your Conference if the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Great Britain were to establish such societies in this Province?—Certainly not.

108. Are not the preachers and members of your church sometimes called *British* Wesleyans in distinction from the Canadian Wesleyans?—I have heard them spoken of as such in private conversation, but they are not officially known as such.

109. Do the church to which you belong and the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England form but one body, or are they two distinct churches?—They may be said to form one body in some respects, but in others they are distinct.

110. In what does that distinction consist?—It consists first, in respect to the powers of the Conferences, the rules or regulations made by one Conference are not binding on the other—and secondly, some difference in the internal economy of each; also in the title by which they are distinguished.

111. In what does the union between the two bodies consist?—A union in doctrine—in the conditions of membership, or general rules—in church fellowship or communion—one church receiving and recognizing the members of the other as brothers reciprocally.

112. Is a member of your Conference a member of the British Conference by virtue of his being a Member of the former?—No; when we speak of Members of Conference we speak of Preachers.

113. Is a Member of the British Conference in full connexion received by your Conference into full connexion, or is it considered a privilege on the part of your Conference to reject or receive such Members?—All Preachers presented for reception into our conference are admitted by vote, and if received, they are in the same standing as in the conference they came from.

114. Would you consider it a privilege of your conference if a member of the Wesleyan Methodist conference in Great Britain in good standing presented himself for admission into your conference to reject him?—As I have already said, they admit them by vote,—it is, of course, the privilege of conference to admit them or not.

115. If a member of the Wesleyan Methodist conference in Great Britain, on the supernuanced relation of that conference, in good standing, should apply for admission into your conference, is it the privilege of your conference to reject such an one's application for admission into the same?—I think that it is; but they would have some particular reasons for it.

116. Would you be good enough to state these reasons?—I cannot state reasons for others, there are no specific rules laid down—the reasons would arise out of the circumstances of the case.

117. Would it be any breach of the articles of union if a majority of your conference should vote against such an application?—I think not, but unless there were special weighty reasons for it such rejection might occasion a breach of good understanding.

118. Then is it understood that the rejection of a member of the Wesleyan conference in Great Britain, in good standing, applying for admission into your conference, depends more on the vote of your conference?—As I have stated formerly, that his reception depended upon the vote of the conference, and if that vote was not given he would not be admitted—there may be reasons arising from circumstances of the case that would cause his rejection.

119. Will a member of the Wesleyan Methodist conference in Great Britain, in good standing, of consequence, lose his privilege as a member of your conference by its vote, notwithstanding the union between the two conferences?—I consider he is not a member of conference until admitted by vote, but his rejection by our conference would not, of itself, affect his standing in his own conference.

120. Did the conference in England acknowledge your conference as a branch of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion when you were called the Methodist Episcopal church, and treat with you accordingly?—I am not aware that they did, and certain circumstances would lead me to think they did not.

121. Will you be good enough to state for the information of this committee those circumstances?—The principal circumstance to which I allude is the establishing missions in Upper Canada, having no communication with us, and no interchange of communication between their conference and ours acknowledging a relation of that kind.

121. What mission stations had they in the province at the time the union was formed?—One at Kingston, one at York, and one at St. Clair.

123. Did the British conference at the same time acknowledge the Methodist Episcopal church in America as part of the Wesleyan body?—They acknowledged them (the Methodist Episcopal church in the United States) as a branch of Methodists organized by Mr. Wesley and fellowshipped them as such.

124. On whose part were proposals for union first made, and what proceedings were had thereon till it was finally ratified?—I have understood they were first made at a meeting of the Missionary Board in York when I was not present—at a subsequent meeting of the Board when I was present, the subject was discussed and recommended to the conference, and Mr. Alder was invited to remain and attend the conference for that purpose. At conference the question was submitted to a committee of nine, who presented a report founded on certain resolutions, which were adopted by the conference and published. Mr. E. Ryerson was sent to England as delegate of the Canadian conference to negotiate the union—the English conference accepted the proposals with some amendments which were presented to the Canadian conference in 1833, and the union finally ratified.

125. Did Mr. Alder make any stipulations on the part of his Conference as conditions of the proposed union?—He did not make any stipulations strictly speaking, as he said he was not authorized so to do, but he mentioned several particulars that he was of opinion his conference would probably require of ours.

126. What were those stipulations or particulars, or what did Mr. Alder say his Conference would require of yours?—One related to the Christian Guardian—I think he either said it should be divested of its political character, or its political character be changed—another related to district meetings, that they should be established here, and to camp meetings, and another to regulations relative to local Preachers.

127. Did your conference send Mr. Egerton Ryerson to England to negotiate with the British Conference relative to the Union?—Yes.

128. Who was appointed editor of the Guardian at the Conference of 1834, or when the Union was proposed?—I was.

129. Was your appointment in consequence of Mr. Ryerson's declining to serve that year?—Mr. Ryerson intima-

ted previous to the sitting of conference that he should decline serving as editor, or to that effect; but on the eve of the election of Editor he offered to serve as such for the ensuing year, provided they chose to elect him.

130. If Mr. Ryerson had been re-appointed Editor that year, how would his place have been supplied during his absence to England?—I cannot say how his place would have been supplied; but he proposed a substitute, during his absence, in case he was elected.

131. Who was the substitute?—He said there was a young gentleman that Mr. Alder proposed to him as substitute, but I do not know that he mentioned his name.

132. Did you understand from Mr. Alder that the Christian Guardian was to change its political character in the sense of advocating in future a contrary system of politics to that it had previously advocated, or was it intended that it should not interfere in politics at all?—I cannot say that there was any thing specific in relation to advocating another system of politics—and 'it was my impression it was to be diverted of its political character.

133. Do you believe the Christian Guardian advocates the same system of politics now it did before the Union?—I think not.

134. Did Mr. Alder say that it was contrary to the spirit and practice of Wesleyan Methodism to take any part in the party politics of the day?—Such remark might have been made by him, but I am not prepared to say positively, that he did.

135. During the discussion of the union question were expectations raised on the part of the members of your conference to share in the funds of the British connexion should the union be effected?—I think expectations were raised in some to share in certain funds of the British connexion.

136. Was there a motion made and put from the chair that you should share in the funds of the British conference?—Such a motion could not be made—it was impracticable.

137. What were the grounds of these expectations?—The first mention made of the union was in the meeting of the missionary board in which Mr. J. Ryerson stated that he had an interview with Messrs. Alder and Hick in which they gave him to understand that should a union take place similar to that existing between the English and Irish conferences we would probably have a grant of their contingent fund, as they were in the practice of granting out of that fund to the Irish conference to supply the deficiencies of poor circuits, and again frequent mention was made by Mr. Alder during the discussion of the question in conference, of the prospect of such a grant:—he gave a statement of the different funds, and of the financial system of the British conference, and showed that as the contingent fund was for supplying the deficiencies of poor circuits, we might expect something from it, or to that effect: several remarks were made by members of conference relative to such a grant.

138. Were those expectations realised?—Not that I know of.

139. Was Mr. Ryerson instructed to make any arrangement relative to appropriations of money from the British conference to yours?—He was.

140. What was the purport of his instructions on this point?—I am not prepared to say what the instructions precisely were, but I will state the substance of the proceedings relative to them:—it was proposed that he should be instructed to assure the British conference that whatever monies they might appropriate to the work in Canada should be strictly and faithfully applied to the particular object specified for them.—It was moved in amendment to the effect, that he should be instructed to assure them that whatever monies they might think proper to appropriate to the Canadian conference would be faithfully applied to such objects as the Canadian conference might think proper; which amendment was carried—there were some alteration made afterwards relative to that part but I am not prepared to say what it was.

141. Have you any knowledge of the receipt of certain grants from government to aid the Methodist church in this province—if so please state what you know concerning them?—The first knowledge I obtained of any grant being

made to aid the Methodist church in this province was from communications from Mr. Barry, Wesleyan Missionary, in the Courier: I heard no more of any such grant until after the close of the session of conference in 1833, I then understood that Mr. Maraden had received £900 sterling as Treasurer of the Wesleyan Missionary committee, London, and that the same was put into the Missionary fund for the purpose of aiding the mission work in this province;—in 1834 a note came into my hands addressed "The Wesleyan Methodist Conference" from the Lieut. Governor's office, enclosed to me, stating that "the Lieut. Governor has been authorised to place at the disposal of this year of the British Wesleyan conference the sum of £550, to be applied in erecting such churches or chapels as may be required, and to inform you that on your stating the manner in which the grant is to be applied, His Excellency will order the amount to be placed at your disposal"—in the course of the day the Rev. Mr. Stinson called at my house and asked for such a note, and said it was intended to be sent to him—I gave it to him, and know no more of the circumstances than what is before the public.

142. Was any intimation given to your Conference of the tender of any grant by Government to the Methodists in this Province either before the union or since? There was nothing communicated to our conference before the union, and nothing officially since—that I know of.

143. Was no report made to your conference of the reception of such grants by the superintendent of the missions? None that I know of.

144. Did your conference institute any inquiry respecting said grants as to their design, application, &c. after it was known they had been received? Not any.

145. Was no motion made, or proceedings had in conference relative to said grants? There was.

146. What were they and their results? There was a motion made in form of a resolution in conference in 1834, and also in 1835, to have the conference declare its opinion relative to the propriety of supporting religious institutions and ministers of religion by grants from the public funds, and to disavow any participation in any such grants except for the Missionary work, or to that effect, which was lost: There were proceedings also at the conference in 1835, in consequence of addresses from two quarterly meetings—the result of which is published in the minutes of Conference.

147. Who moved the resolution or motion for a declaration of opinion in your Conference on the subject? I did.

148. Have any of your societies addressed the Conference on the subject of the grants from Government? The only addresses the Conference received were from the two quarterly meetings already mentioned—one of which was from Yonge Street circuit and the other from Brockville.

149. Have not the members of your church expressed their opinion directly to the Conference without the intervention of a quarterly or other official meeting? They have not, and I believe it would be against a rule of Conference to do so.

150. Who compose your official meetings? There are several official meetings, as quarterly meetings, local preachers' meetings, and stewards and leaders' meetings—the quarterly meetings are composed of the travelling and local preachers, stewards, class-leaders, and exhorters with the chairman of the district—the local preachers' meeting is a meeting of the local preachers with the superintendent of the circuit—the leaders' meeting is a meeting of the leaders and stewards with the superintendent.

151. Who presides at those meetings? The chairman of the district at the quarterly meeting, and the superintendent of the circuit or station at the other meetings.

152. Can no other than a preacher appointed by the conference preside at those official meetings? No other.

153. What if the chairman refuse to put a motion, cannot his place be supplied by the meeting appointing

another for that purpose, or has the meeting no means of redress in such case? His place cannot be supplied—as soon as he leaves the chair or is removed from it, the meeting is dissolved.

154. Had you such rules respecting those meetings before the union or have they been introduced since? They have been introduced since.

155. Mr. Alder stated, in reply to the question proposed to him by the committee of the House of Commons in 1823 on the civil government of the Canadas whether there were any Methodists in the Legislative or Executive Council?—“I do not know, I should wish to state that we consider ourselves as a branch of the church of England both at home and abroad”—from which it is to be inferred he considers the Wesleyan Methodists both here and at home members of the church of England—are therefore the members of your church, considered, since the union, members of the Church of England?—Whatever Mr. Alder's opinion may be it is not mine that the members of the Methodist church in this Province are members of the church of England.

156. Do you consider the conference to which you belong an ecclesiastical establishment? In one sense, in common with all other churches, it is, but it cannot be said to be legally so. I consider a legal church establishment to be one organized by the law of the land, and provision made by the same for its support.

157. Was it not urged on your conference to abolish Episcopacy because that form of church government was not proper for Methodists in a British colony, as it interfered with the establishment of the church of England? There was some remarks made to that effect in the course of the discussion.

158. Who made these remarks and where were they made? They were made in the conference, when the question for abolishing Episcopacy was under discussion; they were made by Mr. Alder in reply to my remarks on observations made by Mr. E. Ryerson.

159. Was it not stated in connexion with those remarks, that those were Mr. Wesley's views?—When we were in discussion on the question of abolishing Episcopacy, Mr. Ryerson observed, that Mr. Wesley gave the Episcopal form of church government to the Methodists in the United States, because they were separated from the political institutions of the Mother Country—I remarked in reply that that was not his only reason, but that they were not only separated from the Mother Country politically, but from the hierarchy of the Church of England; and therefore he invaded no man's right in establishing Episcopacy in that country; and that the same reasons applied to this Province in favor of Methodist Episcopacy; unless it were admitted by the church, which I did not suppose it was, that the church of England was established in this Province.—Mr. Alder then remarked, that this being a British colony the British Constitution was established here and that the established church of England was a part of that Constitution; and he added such were Mr. Wesley's views, or to that effect.

160. Were there no objections made on the part of your preachers to the position that the church of England was established in the Province?—I made objections myself and I think others did.

161. Does your conference share in the mission funds of the English conference?—The missions in this Province connected with our conference are supported by the funds of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in England, whose missions they are.

162. Have you heard any of the members of your conference assert that the Church of England is the established Church of this Province?—I have not.

163. Do you think it is the general opinion in your conference that the Church of England is not established in this Province?—I think it is.

164. Has your church any other mission stations in the Province than those among the Indians?—They have a few.

165. Will you please to name what stations or circuits they are?—The past year the Isle of Tonti mission, Sidney mission, Cavan mission, Clarendon mission, Brock mission; the four last were missions in part because of destitute set-

tlements in the vicinity of those places.—The present year, the Isle of Tonti and Guelph.

166. Were not the Sidney and Brock missions formerly included in regular circuits?—There were regular circuits called Sidney and Brock circuits, and there are now, but my former answer explains why they were reported as missions in part—owing to the new and destitute settlements in the vicinity.

167. Did you form missions elsewhere than among the Indians before the union?—Yes, occasionally.

168. Are you aware that £300 are charged in the Wesleyan Methodist Society's Report of Great Britain for aid to poor circuits out of the Missionary funds?—I am not aware of it, as I have not looked over the Report to inform myself.

169. Are not some of the regular circuits aided occasionally from the mission funds?—I am not aware that they are, except in the cases before-mentioned of part missions.

170. By whom are your mission stations formed and missionaries appointed thereto?—They are formed since the union by a committee of the conference, consisting of the President, General Superintendent of the mission, the Chairmen of the districts, and seven other persons appointed by the Canadian conference, together with a standing board or committee consisting of preachers and laymen to act in the interim of conference.

171. Are all these persons necessarily members of your conference, excepting such as compose the laymen of the Missionary Board?—It is understood, tho' not expressed in the regulations.

172. By what means are your preachers supported on the circuits?—On all the circuits that are not on the missionary plan, they are supported by the voluntary contributions of the society and friends of the church.

173. Is it in the power of the conference to put any of the circuits or stations on the missionary plan, and provide for the same accordingly?—I think that if the missionary committee at the conference, mentioned before, together with the stationing committee of conference, and the parent committee in England concur, any of the circuits or stations can be put on the missionary plan accordingly.

174. Are the missionaries of the mission stations, and such as are connected with your conference members of the same—do they sit and vote on all questions introduced and decided there?—All members of the conference in attendance have a right to sit and vote, missionaries not excepted.

175. Is the right of petitioning to your conference excluded from the members, except thro' the official bodies mentioned in answer to questions 148 and 149?—I refer to my answer to the questions mentioned.

176. What were the stipulations and particulars respecting Camp Meetings and Local Preachings mentioned by Mr. Alder at the conference of 1832, and alluded to in your answer to question 126?—In relation to Camp Meetings, that they should be laid aside; and in respect to Local Preachings, that they should be similar to those in England.

177. Was the political conduct of your preachers or members talked over in the conversation with Mr. Alder at the conference of 1832, while mentioning the conditions on which the British conference would be likely to accede to the union?—I do not recollect any thing to that effect.

178. Was there a committee appointed by the conference in Hallowell to take into consideration the subject of the union?—There was.

179. Were you a member of that committee?—I was.

180. Was Mr. Evans a member of that committee?—I think not.

181. Would you not have had an opportunity of knowing more of Mr. Alder's views on the subject of the union than he (Mr. Evans) would; he not being a member of that committee?—Being on the committee I probably had a better opportunity of knowing Mr. Alder's views than Mr. E. had; but I think I knew no more of them than he did, as I did not ascertain his views until they were disclosed in open conference.

# 14 Evidence to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

182. Did Mr. Alder at any time come before the committee to give information on the subject?—I do not recollect; he might have done so.

183. Do you believe that the members of your church are satisfied with government grants being made for the support of missions and missionaries, or other religious purposes?—As far as I am acquainted I think they are not; as there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction expressed in my hearing, and much uneasiness on the subject.

184. Do you think they would be at all dissatisfied if the Commons' House of Assembly were to address his Majesty to withhold such grants?—I think generally they would be well pleased with such an address.

185. Is it your opinion that those grants are or have been conducive to the spiritual interests of your church?—I think quite the contrary.

186. Was the conference of which you are a member ever known by the name of the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference?—Not within my recollection.

187. Was the British Wesleyan Methodist conference formerly or ever the Episcopal Methodist church?—Not that I know of.

188. Was the conference of which you are a member formerly designated as the conference of the Methodist Episcopal church?—Yes.

[Mr. Morrison read in his place as a member of the committee the latter marked B. appended.]

189. Has any grant of money from the government ever been made to, or received by, your conference?—I know of no other grants but those I have mentioned contained in a former answer.

190. Were any of those grants you mentioned made to your conference?—As I understand, those grants were made to the Wesleyan conference in England for the purpose of aiding the work in this province, and for that purpose were put in the missionary fund and expended in support of the missions connected with our conference.

191. To whom is the Rev. Joseph Stinson accountable for the monies which he receives for missionary purposes? He accounts to the treasurer of the parent society in London.

192. Are the missionaries or any of them who are paid from these funds or grants members of your conference, and do they vote on all questions decided there?—Some of them are and they have the same right to vote on all questions as other members.

193. Are any of your missionaries members of the British conference exclusively, or any of the preachers employed as missionaries solely under the direction of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference or missionary society in England?—None that I know of.

194. Can the missionary committee in London, or the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England, appoint to or remove any missionary from his station, and can any such missionary be a member of your Conference and the British conference at one and the same time?—None except the general superintendent of the missions, can be directly appointed to or removed from his station by the missionary committee in London. The general superintendent of missions is a member of our conference and of the British conference likewise.

195. Can the missionary superintendent of himself appoint a missionary to his station. Is he not merely associated with a committee appointed by the conference and other persons nominated by your discipline to appoint missionaries to those stations?—He has the power of supplying vacancies that have not been supplied by the stationing committee of conference but no power to appoint others.

196. From what source do such of the ministers of your church as are employed on missions receive their salaries?—From the Wesleyan Methodist missionary funds.

197. Do any of them receive an income from their congregations in addition to the salary received from the missionary committee?—All they receive as missionaries is accounted for to the treasurers of the missionary society. The preacher on the Guelph mission this year, is allowed to receive if he can raise it from the people, something in addition to the allowance from the missionary committee as he is a married man, the appropriation to the mission being only a single man's allowance. Also the preachers la-

boring on those missions in part, (before mentioned) receive from the congregations on other parts of their field of labor. But in no case can any one receive more on the whole than the allowance stated in the discipline of the church.

198. Is the salary of any one of them raised or increased in consequence of the grants made by the Government to the missionary committee in London?—Not in my opinion.

199. Is there not a committee appointed at each session of the conference to which you belong for the purpose of apportioning the monies granted for missionary purposes by the missionary committee in London?—There is.

200. Has the committee appointed by your conference, or has the conference itself any authority to control the missionary committee in London in regard to the means by which they shall raise money for the purpose of carrying on the missionary work?—I know of no means they have to control the missionary conference in London.

201. Is your conference and missionary society compelled to receive funds from the parent society out of any source, that the latter may choose to secure them, to expend on your missionary work?—They the missionary committee of our conference have no resources of their own, they must therefore either receive them from the parent society or have none for the support of the missionary work.

202. Are not the missions in Upper Canada by the articles of Union made the missions of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society?—They are. It is expressly said they shall be regarded as such under certain regulations specified in the act of agreement.

203. Do you conceive that you may receive funds from the parent society for the support of your mission work even from exceptional sources, and not be held accountable for so doing?—From our close connexion with the parent society in England any thing justly exceptionable in their transactions must necessarily reflect upon us.

204. Do you entertain the opinion that government grants for missionary purposes are exceptionable in a religious point of view?—In many respects I think them exceptionable.

205. Is the money granted by the Wesleyan Missionary committee in London for the support of the mission work paid through the missionary committee in Canada, or does the latter committee only determine the amount of the annual allowance of the missionaries?—They only determine the amount. The money is paid through the General Superintendent of missions.

206. Whose agent is he the superintendent, and by whom paid?—He is agent to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London, appointed and paid by them.

207. Is the money paid for your mission work solely paid at the instance and under the authority of the superintendent of Missions?—As I said before the Missionary Committee of our Conference determines the amount to be paid according to the book of discipline, and the general superintendent pays the same accordingly.

208. Have you seen the Missionary report of the parent Society in London for the year 1834, an extract from which Mr. Evans has given in as evidence?—I have not read it, and I am not acquainted with the extract alluded to.

209. Are you aware it states the late Lieut. Governor put into the hands of the missionary society in London, £200 to be devoted to the missionary expenditures of the society in Upper Canada?—I am not aware of it because I have not read any document on the subject.

210. Are the missionary funds to which you allude in your answer to question 196 and from which the missionaries are paid, composed in part from the grants made from the public funds of this Province?—I understood it so, that is, from public funds raised in this Province.

211. You say that several of the Preachers who are paid from those funds or grants, are members of your conference and have a like privilege with other members of voting on all questions decided there, does the conference or a majority of its members approve of their being paid in this way or have they exercised the powers they possessed to prevent their being so paid?—I have said that the missionaries were paid from the missionary fund, that those of them who are members of our conference have a like privilege with other members of voting.

212. Do you think any of those ministers who are supported from the mission funds, of which these grants form a part, consider them in the light of a bribe from the Government?—I have no reason to think they do.

213. Are you aware that the treasurer of your missionary society in this Province did receive the £900 paid over to Mr. Marsden by the Government?—I am not aware of it.

214. Do you know that Mr. Marsden transmitted the money he so received to London into the treasury of the missionary society there?—No, he left it in the hands of Mr. Stinson to be expended here, and that saved transmitting it from England.

215. To whose credit was it placed by Mr. Stinson and to whom did he account for it?—I understood that he placed it to the credit of the parent society in London, or accounted to them for it.

216. Will you explain to the committee the difference between receiving Government grants direct or receiving them from that Society or body who received them from the Government?—The difference is obvious,—the one case receiving them directly, the other indirectly.

217. Is there any difference in the effects, consequences or propriety of such proceedings?—There is little or no difference in my opinion.

218. In such a case if there is anything so morally wrong or injurious in a part of your Conference being paid in such a manner do you not consider the whole Conference implicated, by not exercising the powers with which they are vested to prevent it?—This question calls for an expression of opinion obvious to all—that if any thing be morally wrong on the part of any of the members of the conference, the whole body must be in some measure implicated, unless they exercise what powers they possess to prevent or correct it.

219. Do you think the mission work in this country has suffered in consequence of the Government Grants which have been made to the Wesleyan Missionary committee in London?—I think that the work in general has suffered in consequence thereof.

220. Do you think that it is equally improper for the missionaries to receive their support from the mission fund, under the present circumstances as it would be to receive it direct from the Government?—I think not; because it is not optional with them, they have not a choice from whom they receive it.

221. Do you think it is morally wrong for any of the members of the conference to receive their support from the missionary fund, supported, as it is at present?—I see no immorality in it—every man's conscience in that respect must be his own guide.

222. Did you feel bound or in any wise influenced by any conversation, discussion or arrangements which took place at the conference in Hallowell in 1832 to change the political character of the Christian Guardian?—Not in any wise.

223. Did the conference at its next or any subsequent session censure or express their disapprobation of the political course pursued by the Guardian, so far as it interfered with politics while under your direction?—No—they passed a vote fully approving the manner in which I conducted the paper.

224. While you edited the Guardian were you not engaged in a controversy with Mr. Barry relative to Government Grants for the support of the Church Ministry?—I was engaged in a controversy with him, which arose out of some remarks I made relative to some grants to certain denominations.

225. What in your opinion is the nature of the political principles advocated before and since the union by the Guardian, are they opposites or are they in union?—It exerts a political influence very different since the union to what it did before.

226. Did you as a Minister of the Methodist Church in this Province, approve of the political course of the Guardian either before or since the union?—I think that it has meddled too much with politics both before the union and since.

227. What political principles does the Guardian now advocate which are opposite to those formerly advocated by

it—can you point out any particularly?—I have not said it was *avowedly* changed in its principles, but I have said it exerts an influence different to that before the union, in the politics of the country. It seems now to be in favor of things as they are, rather than for reform, which it formerly so strongly advocated.

228. Did you during the controversy with Mr. Barry condemn the Wesleyan Missionary Committee for having accepted of the government grant which was offered to them?—The remarks I made on the government grants were made when I was in ignorance of any such being made to the Wesleyan Missionary Conference, and in the controversy which arose out of them, I was not called upon to express an opinion particularly relative to them, but had I been aware when I made the remarks alluded to, that they had received a grant similar to the others, I should have been equally as free in my remarks on it.

229. Did you approve of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary committee in your controversy with Mr. Barry, for receiving government grants for missionary purposes?—No, I did not.

230. Had the Missionaries a choice of the manner in which they might be paid their salaries. Would you think it would be as equally improper for them to receive their support from the Mission fund under the present circumstances as it would be to receive it direct from the government?—Very little difference in that case, in my opinion.

231. Do you believe that if a preacher were to declare he could not conscientiously enter the Mission work under the present arrangement your conference would oblige him to do so?—I think there would be a deference paid to his conscientious scruples.

232. You have said that the Conference passed a vote of thanks in your favor for the way you had conducted the Christian Guardian; are you aware that the conference has approved of the manner the Guardian has been edited since you ceased to be its editor?—I am not aware that they have expressed their approbation directly.

233. Are you aware that they have expressed it indirectly?—At the conference of 1834, which was one year after I had ceased to be editor, they elected me to that office, but I declining to serve, they elected Mr. Ryerson.

234. What was the cause of your declining to serve as editor?—There were several causes, but the principal reason was that the feelings of parties relative to the Guardian were so strong, I was apprehensive I was not adequate to the task.

235. Since monies are paid to our local government to be expended on Missionary purposes under the direction of a Missionary committee connected with your conference is the political feeling of your conference the same as formerly?—I am not able to say respecting the political feeling of the Conference, but the minds of several of its members I think have greatly changed in respect to political matters, yet I would not attribute that to the effect of money paid for Missionary purposes.

236. Is it your belief that our Government would have paid any sums of money to the British Wesleyan Conference unless with the express understanding that such sums would be laid out in this Province in some way connected with the Conference of which you are a member?—I believe that the first grant was made to the Wesleyan Missionary Conference before the union for the purpose of expending it in this Province, under their immediate direction; but the latter grant was evidently made for the purpose of being expended in the Province after we were connected with the conference in England.

237. Are you aware of the Methodist Episcopal conference or any body or individual of that conference petitioning His Majesty's Government for monies to aid in the erection or keeping in repair Churches or Chapels or to give aid towards Missionary purposes under the control of that conference?—I am fully of opinion there was no such application from the Methodist Conference in this country or from any of its members.

238. Is the Canada Conference not bound by the articles of union to receive into their body from the English Conference every year a certain number of their Preachers?—It is not so understood by our Conference (see 4th article of union and note hereto appended.)



# 16 Evidence to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

239. Are you aware that monies are paid by the Government of Upper Canada from the funds of the Casual and Territorial Revenue of the Province for the aid and support of religious purposes under the management of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference?—I am aware that monies have been paid by the government from the Casual and Territorial Revenue of the Province for those purposes.

240. Do you understand by the Wesleyan Methodists mentioned in the foregoing question the Conference to which you belong?—I understand the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference.

241. Are they not connected?—They are connected in the manner formerly explained.

242. Do you consider the Missions in Canada as wholly connected with the Parent Society or are they not as you have already observed the Missions of your Church, whose Missionary Society is auxiliary to the Parent Society?—They are Missions of our Church as well as of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in England.

Tuesday, 31st March, 1836.

Committee met.

THE REV. WILLIAM CASE, called in and examined.

243. Are you a member of the Methodist Conference in this Province, formerly known as the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada?—Yes, I am.

244. By what title is said Conference now distinguished?—The conference of the "Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada."

245. How long has the church to which you belong had the title of the Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada?—Since October 1833.

246. Is that since the union with the British conference?—It is.

247. Is there another body of Methodists in the Province called Wesleyan Methodists?—There is another body of Methodists in this country sometimes called Ryanites, otherwise the "Canadian Wesleyan Methodist church."

248. Are not the preachers and members of your church sometimes called "British Wesleyans," in distinction from the Canadian Wesleyans?—"British Wesleyans" is not the name by which our church is known.—That name distinguishes the large body of Methodists in England, ours is the "Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada."

249. Do you not think it very likely since the union of your church with the British Wesleyan connexion in England the members of your church might be called British Wesleyan Methodists?—I know not why they should be so called.

250. Do the church to which you belong and the Wesleyan Methodists in England form but one body or are they two distinct churches?—They are distinct bodies; the British Conference in England form one distinct and independent body, the Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada forms another distinct and independent body, these two distinct bodies have formed a union.

251. In what respect are they the same and how are they distinct?—They are the same in doctrine, or the general rules of the society; as also in the great outlines of their economy; such as itinerancy, plans of benevolence, the support of their regular ministry by voluntary contributions, &c. but they are distinct in name, and independent of each other. The Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England are recognized in Mr. Wesley's deed of settlement enrolled in Chancery, by which their chapel and church property are held, and by which the acts of the conference become legal. The conference of the "Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada" is the same as that formerly known as the "Methodist Episcopal church in Canada"; the alteration of name and the *Episcopal form*, having been in accordance with a rule in its constitution, authorising such alterations. These two conferences are distinct and independent.—They manage their own internal economy in their own way, free of the interference of each other, neither having any ecclesiastical jurisdiction or control over the members (preachers or people) of the other so distinct are they, that the ministers of the one conference have no right or claim to membership in the other conference without their consent, and a regular admittance.

Neither has the one conference any control over the funds of the other. These two bodies have formed a "union" the articles of which see Discipline, page 151.

252. Did the conference in England acknowledge your conference as a branch of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion when you were called the Methodist Episcopal church, and treat with you accordingly?—In the articles of the union the Canadian conference was so acknowledged and treated with accordingly.

253. Did they not consult with your conference or your superintendent when you were called the Methodist Episcopal church, about establishing their missions or forming societies of their own in this Province?—Such a correspondence did take place between Mr. Townley of the Mission Board in London, and our Missionary Board in York, held at the residence of Dr. Morrison, one of its members.—At a sitting of this Board a union was recommended between the two conferences, with one dissentient only, which recommendation was laid before the conference at Hallowell in 1832.

254. What mission stations had they in the Province at the time the union was formed?—One at Kingston, one at York, and a third at St. Clair.

255. On whose part were proposals for the union first made, and what proceedings were had thereon till it was finally ratified?—The first official proposals were made on the part of the Canada conference, at which time they commissioned an agent to proceed to England to treat with the British Conference on the subject.

256. Did Mr. Alder make any stipulation on the part of his conference as conditions of the proposed union?—I think Mr. Alder made statements at the Hallowell conference in 1832 as to his opinions of what the British conference would expect if the union were formed.

257. What were those stipulations or statements?—My recollection is not clear on the subject. Mr. Evans' answer to the 14th question on this subject I believe to be correct.

258. Did your conference send Mr. Egerton Ryerson to England to negotiate with the British conference relative to the union?—They did.

259. Who was appointed editor of the Guardian at the conference of 1832 or when the union was proposed?—Mr. Richardson.

260. Was Mr. Richardson's appointment in consequence of Mr. Ryerson's declining to serve that year?—I knew not that he declined any proposal of the kind on the part of the conference.

261. If Mr. Ryerson had been appointed editor that year how would his place have been supplied during his absence to England?—I have no answer to that question.

262. During the discussion of the union question were expectations raised on the part of the members of your conference to share in the funds of the British connexion should the union be effected?—It was understood by the Canada conference that the missions were to be taken under the care of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society and that they were to supply the funds necessary for the mission work.

263. Was it not also expected by the members of your conference that they would share in other funds of the British Wesleyan conference besides those that they might impart for the missionary work?—Others might have expected—I expected none.

264. Did any discussion take place in your conference on the subject of any other funds of the British Wesleyan conference other than those for missionary purposes, while the union was under consideration?—There was a conversation upon the subject between Mr. Alder and the conference.

265. Might it not have been possible, notwithstanding, that expectations might have been raised in the minds of your members of their participation in those funds, or is it not very likely that the conversation alluded to might have raised those expectations?—Mr. Alder stated to the conference that he was not authorised by his conference to encourage such expectations,—that the Canada conference would have no claim on the funds of the British conference in consequence of the union, that his own opinion was that

over the funds  
and a "union"  
151.

knowledge your  
Methodist Epis-  
copal Church  
—In the articles  
—do acknowledge.

ference or your  
Methodist Epis-  
copal Church  
or forming  
such a correspon-  
dence of the Mission  
in York, held at  
members.—At a  
sented between  
only, which re-  
cise at Hallowell

the Province at  
Kingston, one at

the union first  
recon till it was  
were made on  
which time they  
and to treat with

on the part of  
the union!—I  
allowed confer-  
British confer-

ments.—My  
Mr. Evans' an-  
sive to be cor-

tion Ryerson to  
erence relative

guardian at the  
proposed.—Mr.

in consequence  
?—I knew out  
on the part of

ditor that year  
ing his absence  
tion.

question were  
members of your  
ish connexion  
stood by the  
to be taken un-  
onary Society  
essary for the

members of your  
funds of the  
at they might  
ight have ex-

or conference  
ish Wesleyan  
poses, while  
was a conver-  
d the confu-

withstanding,  
the minds of  
funds, or is it  
might have  
to the confer-  
a conference  
h conference  
ion was that

assistance might be given by the British conference to aid in carrying on the regular work in the circuits.

206. Did your conference since the union realize those expectations?—In the first article of the union it is provided that the Canadian Preachers should have no claim on the funds of the British conference; the Canada preachers have never received any assistance from the British conference, otherwise than from the Missionary Society in support of missions in this country.

207. Was Mr. Ryerson instructed to make any arrangement relative to appropriations of money from the British conference to yours?—Instructions were given him on various matters connected with the objects of his mission.

208. What were the purport of his instructions on this point?—I am not in possession of proper information to answer that question. For the result of his mission I refer to the articles of the union, see Discipline, page 151.

209. Have you any knowledge of the receipt of certain grants from government to aid the Methodist Church in this Province, if so, please state what you know concerning them?—I know there has been considerable said on the subject and a great deal of excitement created thereon in some parts of the country, but I can say that the Canada conference have never received any sums of money from the British government for any purpose whatever.

210. Do you mean to be understood to say that your church has received no aid from Government grants?—They have received none to my knowledge.

211. Are you aware that Government Grants have been made to the Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion in London for the purpose of being expended on the missionary work of your church in Canada?—I am aware that the government did previously to the union of the two conferences grant to the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London the sum of £900 sterling to be expended on their missions in this country, and that subsequently the sum of £550 sterling was granted to the said Missionary Society in London to be applied towards the support of their missions on the same way.

212. Are not those excitements of which you have spoken, in your opinion, chiefly attributable to the grants of money made by the government towards the support of missionaries in this Province?—It is my opinion that the excitements are attributed rather to the misrepresentations which have been made relative to the Government Grants.

213. By whom have these misrepresentations been made?—I refer in the first place to the misrepresentations that have been made—as appeared in an Almanack entitled "the Canadian True Blues, by Patrick Swift, Esq. M. P. P. professor of Astrology, York," page 18, and headed "corruption unmasked."—Under this offensive summary, in the title, is said to be an estimate of money and money's value, raised in taxes, fees, monopolies, land-jobs, and otherwise from the people of Upper Canada, and of which the Methodist Episcopal Church is said to have received £1,900—this erroneous statement appeared in the 2nd edition of the same Almanack for the same year—widely spread as these messengers of slander have been, they have probably been read by many who have had no means of obtaining information to the contrary—and could have no suspicion of the design to mislead. By such misrepresentations I believe excitements have been created.

Another erroneous statement appears in the 7th Report of the Committee on Grievances, page 4, viz: "The patronage of the Crown was exercised in this Province, includes the payments of gifts, salaries, pensions, and retired allowances, to the Clergy of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, and Roman Catholic orders" as far as this regards the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Canada, it is incorrect, as they have received neither gifts, salaries, pensions, or retired allowances from the government.—In the same report, page 15, it is stated, that the British Wesleyan Methodist Conference, formerly the Methodist Episcopal Church received £1000 in 1833, and £611 in 1834,—these two errors I wish to mention here—the first is that the British Wesleyan Methodist conference was formerly "the Methodist Episcopal Church." The second is that the Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada

which I suppose is here meant, ever received either the one or the other of these sums.—That this statement is meant to apply to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Canada, will appear from the comment on the next page (p. 16) of the Report, where the Government Grants are represented to have had the effect of a bribe on that body. Now the only evidence I believe referring to these grants in this case is on page 132 of the Appendix. Here the Receiver General states that the sum of £2000 was paid to Messrs. Haslope and Marsden for missionary purposes, and on page 140 the sum of £2112.2 was paid to the Rev. Joseph Stinson, Representative of the "Methodist Missionary Society in London." These statements go to show that the Government Grants were paid, not to the "Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Canada," but to the Treasurers (Messrs. Haslope and Marsden) and Rev. J. Stinson, Representative of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London.

I have also to refer to another erroneous statement in the Grievance Report, on page 15, it is stated, that "the Ministers of these ecclesiastical establishments derive their official pensions entirely from the public revenue, raised within the Province, and receive besides an income from their congregations."—On the preceding page (p. 14) you will find in the same article headed ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENTS, that a prominent reference is made to the "Methodists of two conferences not in connexion with each other," which must of course include the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in Canada. If then the community are made to believe that the "Methodist Episcopal Church receives from money raised in taxes, fees, monopolies, land-jobs, and otherwise, from the people of Upper Canada," £1,000, and that "besides" the Government Grants, the Wesleyan Methodist Conference "receives an income from their congregations," as is stated in the Grievance Report, pages 14 and 15, it is no longer matter of surprise that excitements should be created, and these are my reasons for believing that the excitements were occasioned, rather by misrepresentations relative to those grants, than by the grants themselves. It is much to be regretted that this circumstance, the want of testimony in the case, was not noticed by the Committee on Grievances when they drew up that part of the 7th Report.—It would have saved the feelings of no inconsiderable portion of the community, among whom are not a few of the best well-wishers to the cause of Reform. The last erroneous statement which I wish to refer to, is contained in the supplement to the Christian Guardian of February 20th, 1836: In the debates of the House of Assembly a member of that House is reported to have said that, "he believed that any circuit, which was in arrears in paying the preachers salary at conference, was called a mission, and the deficiency was made up out of the missionary fund, so that in fact the preachers were paid out of this money." I know not on what grounds such a belief was founded.—Other publications equally erroneous might be referred to, but these may suffice.

214. Have the Wesleyan Methodist connexion in England missions independently of your church in this province since the union of your church with that body?—In answer to a previous question I have stated that agreeably to the article of the Union the missions in Canada were taken under their patronage and were to be regarded as the missions of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society for the support of which missions the English Missionary Society were to furnish the funds.

215. Then are you to be understood to mean that no connexion at all exists between the missions under the charge of the superintendent of the Wesleyan Methodist missions in this Province and your church?—No such connexion as that which gives the Wesleyan Methodist church in Canada any control over the funds of the British Wesleyan Missionary Society in London.

216. Do you think that the first paragraph quoted by you in the Grievance Report wholly relates to the Methodist clergy?—I have stated in the answer to a previous question as far as regards the Wesleyan Methodist conference the statement is erroneous.

217. Does it relate (in the term pensions) at all to the Methodist clergy?—It must relate to either "gifts" or "sa-

# 18 Evidence to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

laries" "pensions" or "retired allowances" for no other terms are used, and, under none of these terms have the Methodists of our church received the "Government Patronage" for the meaning in the above paragraph I beg to refer to page 14 of the Grievance Report under the article "ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENTS."

275. Do you not think it also relates to the Clergy of the other denominations mentioned?—With that I have nothing to do. It is the misrepresentations that Government grants have been made to the conference of which I am a member.

279. Are you not aware that pensions are allowed to the clergy of other denominations as by the Report shown in pages 147 and 148?—To the Wesleyan Methodist conference in Canada the Government has made no grants for any purpose whatever, and there appears no evidence in the Appendix on which to found the assertion that the government did grant money to that body.

280. Were no gifts given by the government to Methodist churches in this Province?—None to the church to which I belong.

281. May not the money granted by the government to different religious bodies for religious purposes be looked upon in the light of a gift?—I have no answer to that question.

282. Was any intimation given to your conference of the tender of any grant by government to the Methodists in this Province either before the union or since?—I have no knowledge of any.

283. Was no report made to your Conference of the reception of such grants by the superintendent of the Missions?—The superintendent of the missions may have reported that moneys were received from the grant for the missions under the patronage of the English Wesleyan Conference, but he could never have reported that such grants were made to our conference.

284. Is the committee to understand that your conference in no way hold itself accountable to the public or your church for the transactions of the Wesleyan Missionaries in this Province?—I am not aware of saying any thing to make such a question necessary. The annual reports of the Wesleyan Missionary Society are every year published, in this country, where all moneys, from whatever source, are credited, and the application of them minutely detailed.—Of this any person may know by reference to them.

285. Did your conference institute any inquiry respecting government grants to the Wesleyan Missionary Society in this Province, as to their design, application &c. after it was known they had been received?—In a former answer it is expressed, that no grant was ever made to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in this country, but to the Wesleyan Society in London, to the use of their missions in this Province.

286. Were no proceedings then had in your conference at all on the subject, whether those grants were made either here or in England to the missionary purposes of the Wesleyan Methodists Society in this Province?—The Canada Conference never instituted any proceedings on the subject. Conversations have sometimes taken place, but the conference I am persuaded never considered that any grants were ever made to them—they always understood that the grants were made to the English Wesleyan Missionary Society in London, over whose funds the conference had no control. Of course they could institute no proceedings in what way the society in London should provide funds for their missions in this country.

287. Were no motions or resolutions made in conference relative to said grants?—I believe there was a resolution once offered in the conference on the subject, the disposition of which I do not exactly remember, perhaps it was thrown out, I am apprehensive it was under the persuasion that they had no right to say in what manner the society in London should obtain funds for their missions.

288. Who moved the resolution for a declaration of opinion in your conference on this subject?—It does not occur to me.

289. What are your opinions as to the propriety of public grants for religious purposes?—I know not that I am prepared to give an opinion on this subject in all its bearings. To raise one denomination above another by distinctive privileges, either civil or religious, I consider to be wrong and unjust; and that salaries from Government to ministers of any denomination would occasion much dissatisfaction.—But with respect to the Government grants for the improvement of the Indians in this country, I am of opinion, and have been for many years, that much good may be done in this way to that long neglected people.—I have long thought that there are obligations due to the American Indians which have not been fully discharged by any government on the continent, having been in one way or other for 20 years past connected with societies in the United States and Canada, for the instruction and improvement of the Indian tribes, I have thus formed my opinions; the Governments to which I have referred have done something for the improvement of the Indian tribes, but the grants of those Governments have by no means been equal to the wants and obligations to that unfortunate people.—I consider it one of the noblest acts of the British Government that they have employed their funds for the amelioration of the condition of the poor and the ignorant; and if it is one of the richest boasts of the nation that her government has paid the price of ransom for all her slaves, to me it appears equally glorious, proper and just, to employ funds derived from the lands once held by the Indians in ameliorating their condition.—The American Government has appropriated \$10,000 annually for this purpose; that sum has been paid over to various benevolent societies for the civil and intellectual improvement of the Indians.—In my opinion the British Government have no occasion to hesitate in adopting a similar course—what they have done has already told nobly.—The conversion of more than 1000 Indians who were once so many drunkards, is an honor to the christian church and to the Government, who may have in several ways aided in her successful efforts.

290. Has the annual appropriation of \$10,000 alluded to in your last answer been appropriated by the Legislature of the United States, or has it been given by the Executive Government without the consent of the Legislature?—I believe in the American Government no appropriation is ever made by the executive without the consent of the Legislature, but in the British Government it is understood to be otherwise.—I know not that I fully understand the right or prerogative of the Crown, but if I do, it is this, that the Crown claims the revenue from certain sources, among which is that arising from the sale of wild lands, a revenue which the Kings of England have always enjoyed, and which has never been conceded to the Provincial Legislature.—That question being, as I understand it, a political one, in controversy between the Legislature of this Province and the Crown, and which question remains unsettled, I do not feel it my duty to give an opinion as to the merits of the case.—If then the Crown claims the prerogative of appropriating the monies arising from such lands, and that it never has been determined by any Act of the Government that the King has no such right, and the King having applied those funds according to his discretion I am, under the impression that no religious body need feel any scruple in receiving funds thus derived and thus given for the improvement of the Indian tribes, who once occupied those lands.

291. Do you think that that is the best way to make Methodist preachers the means of those neglected people getting their due from Government contrary to the wishes of the people out of whose funds the money is taken?—I have supposed that the funds alluded to were not raised by taxation on the community but from the revenue of the Crown arising from the sale of wild lands, which revenue had never been conceded by the King—if it were a settled point that the funds were under the control of the people, I have no hesitation in saying that it were wrong were they offered to receive funds from the Executive Government for any purpose whatever without the consent of the Legislature. I beg here to remark further, that the grants the Government have made to the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London can have no effect to increase in any way the

salary of the Missionaries; it however enables the society to extend its missionary operations for the benefit of the poor and destitute.—I wish also to observe that the society never consented that the Government should pay the salaries of their missionaries—I think I am authorised in saying that offers have been made by the Government to pay the salaries of missionaries, if appointed to the convicts in New Holland, or to the slaves in the West Indies, but the society declined the offer, saying, whatever funds are granted for this object, if paid into the funds of the Missionary Society, will be gratefully acknowledged.

203. It appears by your answer to a former question that the power of the Executive Government to appropriate the revenues alluded to is yet a matter of doubt by the Legislative branches of the country—would it not be therefore the duty of a christianian society to forbear receiving grants from such a source as long as such reception was objectionable to the representative branch of the Government, or displeasing to the people who are contending for the right of having a voice in the disposing of them?—My own private feelings may concur in the suggestion contained in the question not to do any thing that would continue the agitation that is felt in the country on the subject; nevertheless I do not conceive that what has been done by the Government in making them, or the Wesleyan Missionary Society in London receiving them, there has been any impropriety in the case. In offering the above sentiments however I do not wish to be understood to give the sentiments of the conference either in England or in Canada.

203. Would you under all circumstances think it proper or improper that for the future these grants should be suspended till this agitated question is finally settled?—I have no opinion to express.

204. Do you believe that the motive in the Government was such as you express in your examination, purely benevolent, in making these grants?—I have no reason to believe that there were any exceptionable motives in the case; I can only judge from the facts themselves in this and other acts of the British Government, in favor of the oppressed and destitute, and think them to be noble and worthy of a christianian Government. The time was when intellectual improvement was by every means prevented, the people were kept in ignorance, and died in slavery. It accords with every feeling of my heart that any Government should take a more enlightened and christianian course, and for such I shall ever pray.

205. Do you not know that the grant of £2000 made in 1832 was for the purpose of establishing missions for the Wesleyan society among the Indians and several societies, in places where the societies of the former Methodist Episcopal church existed, and did not your conference, your missionary Board and several of the societies under the late conference remonstrate against the same?—I am not aware that the "Grants" were made for creating a rivalry in Societies already established—I know the subject was felt and conversed on and fears were entertained that the establishment of missions by the Wesleyan missionary society in London in the midst of Societies already formed by us would prove a rivalry injurious to religion; and against this proceeding of the society in London we remonstrated—these fears however are done away in the circumstance of the union.

206. Do not the public improvements which have been made out of the funds of this Province and at the disposal of its Legislature and the industry of the people made those public lands valuable, and if so, is it not a tax on the people?—I do not so understand the subject of "taxation." In that sense then the enhanced value of an improved lot in this city is a tax on adjoining premises, where valuable improvements have been made. However others may have understood this question, I know some persons have really supposed the "government grants" were paid out of funds raised by taxes on the people.

207. Do public grants made to the parent society effect, either directly or indirectly, the conference of which you are a member, or any of its members?—It benefits

the missions but does not increase the salary of any missionary or member of the conference.

208. Did you not as a member of the Methodist Episcopal church in the years 1817, 1818, & 1819 warmly and zealously engage in using your own endeavours, and exciting both the preachers and members of that church in Canada to prevent methodist societies under the Wesleyan methodist conference in Great Britain being established in this Province, and have such broken up, as were formed, and did you succeed therein?—I feel very reluctant to refer to a subject which at that time was so painful, and which was afterwards amicably adjusted by the two connexions.

209. Did not the local government in Upper Canada apply to the government at home implicating the character of the preachers of the Methodist Episcopal church, and did not that government apply on the subject to the Wesleyan Missionary committee in London, and did not the committee apply to the methodist Bishops—and they to you on the subject?—I have so understood it, but it is long ago—the subject I believe is passed away and is forgotten and I do not wish to revive it.

300. Do you not think that the close connexion existing between the society in England and your conference is such that if a public grant of money were made for missionary purposes to the former it would benefit your ministers who are employed as such, as much as though it were paid directly to your conference?—I do not know that it would benefit in any other way than by enabling the society to extend the work; It would not increase the salaries of the preachers.—The allowances of the missionaries are fixed by rule of discipline which is always paid, and under no circumstances do they receive more. Were the funds of the society increased a thousand fold it would enable the committee to extend the blessings of the gospel, but the allowances to the missionaries would remain the same.

FRIDAY, 1st April, 1836.

Committee met.

Mr. THOMAS VAUX called in and examined.

301. Are you a member of the Wesleyan Methodist society in this Province?—I am.

302. Was you a member of the Methodist Episcopal church in this Province in the spring or summer of 1832?—I was.

303. Did there exist in this city at the above period a Board of Managers of the Missionary society of the conference of the Methodist Episcopal church?—Yes.

304. Were you Secretary and a member of that board at that period?—Yes.

305. Do you recollect a special meeting of that board being called which met at Dr. Morrison's about that period, and by whom was it called and for what purpose?—There was a special meeting called, I think in June 1832 by the Reverend John Ryerson President of the board of managers of the missionary society, for the purpose of meeting with Mr. Alder, representative of the Wesleyan Missionary society in London.

306. Can you tell who besides yourself, members of that board, and others by invitation attended that meeting?—The Rev. John and the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, Mr. Patrick, Dr. Morrison, Mr. Parke, and I think Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Howard, the Rev. Messrs. Turner, Hick, and Hetherington accompanied Mr. Alder.

307. Have you any recollection of a communication from the Wesleyan Missionary society in London, addressed to the Rev. Wm. Case, and referred to this board, by the conference in either the years 1829-30 or 31 and was it read or acted upon?—There was a communication, it was read and acted upon.

308. Can you produce that communication and the ultimate proceedings had thereon at that or any other board upon that subject?—I am in possession of the communication, and likewise the proceedings had thereon.

(Witness handed in the documents marked C.)

300. Who moved those resolutions and the letter accompanying them at the meeting of the board before alluded to?—I think the Rev. Egerton Ryerson.

310. Were the grounds of that reply and resolutions to the same question, question opposed by any of the members of the board of the Methodist Episcopal church at the meeting at which they were adopted?—I do not recollect any day was opposed.

311. Was the reply of the board to the communication of the Wesleyan missionary committee in London answered by the latter body?—Yes.

312. Have you it, the answer in your possession?—I have.

(Witness handed in the document marked D.)

313. Who was the bearer of that latter communication to Canada?—Mr. Alder.

314. At a meeting of the missionary board before mentioned in the spring and summer of 1832; was that communication read and by whom inadvertently or?—It was read by myself and it became the subject of discussion.

315. Did Mr. Egerton Ryerson defend himself and the Christian Guardian of which he was then and had been for some time Editor against the imputation contained in the said letter, at some length?—He did.

316. Did he not in his defence impute to the Wesleyan Methodist conference political intermeddling, especially in relation to the slave question thus causing much excitement in the colonies, and mother country?—I think he made mention of the circumstance alluded to.

317. Did Mr. Alder reply to him, also, at some length, and do you not think he was exceedingly severe, both on the political character of the Guardian and Methodist body in Canada?—He defended the principles of the 7th Resolution of the Missionary committee in London of date February 1832 very warmly.

318. Was it at that meeting of the Board of managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church the Union was first proposed and by whom?—It was at the meeting that I first heard of the proposal for Union, it was in the course of discussion, it was I think first proposed by the Rev. John Ryerson.

319. Was there a subsequent meeting of the said Board, at which certain Resolutions on the subject of the Union, were discussed and adopted, and by whom were they proposed?—There was a subsequent meeting at which certain Resolutions were proposed, I think by the Rev. E. Ryerson.

320. Was any address to the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church proposed and adopted at that meeting to accompany the said Resolutions and by whom?—Not to my knowledge I have no recollection of it.

321. How were the Resolutions transmitted to the Conference and their attention called to the same, was any letter adopted by the Board or was the President or yourself as Secretary instructed to transmit them requesting their noticing them?—I do not know how the conference came in possession of the Resolutions there was no such letter to my knowledge.

322. Did you or the President on your own responsibility, transmit them to the conference, or was any resolutions or part of a resolution adopted at that board to give you such authority?—I have no recollection of any such resolution, neither did I officially transmit them to the conference.

323. Were they laid before the conference at its ensuing session and by whom did you or the President send them accompanied by a letter from yourself or the President, or did either of you conceive that any thing indirectly in the resolutions themselves gave you such power?—I understood they were laid before the conference but I do not know by whom; there was no such letter to my knowledge, I copied the documents for a member of the conference.

324. Are you aware that any letter was written and sent to the conference accompanying these Resolutions and by whom and who was the member that laid them before conference?—I have answered this to previous questions.

325. Was any request made during the meeting of the board, that Mr. Alder would remain and attend the conference at Hallowell to confer on the proposed Union?—There was, and I think Mr. Alder was made acquainted with it, he was not present at the meeting of the board, at which the above resolutions were passed.

326. Was any request made in any resolution or in any address to Mr. Alder passed by the board?—The request is contained in the resolutions, I am not aware that he was addressed officially.

327. Can you furnish the committee with a copy of the resolutions or proceedings adopted by the board, proposing and recommending the Union?—I have a copy of the resolutions passed at the last meeting.

(Witness handed in a copy of the same marked E.)

328. From the conversation and proceedings at the meeting of the board, do you think it was the intention or wish of the board that the resolutions recommending or proposing the Union should be laid before the ensuing conference? and that Mr. Alder should be requested to remain in the Province and attend the conference?—Such an intention appears to be embodied in the resolutions themselves.

329. Was there any communication made from the board to the Wesleyan missionary committee in London either through Mr. Alder or otherwise, or was a copy of the resolutions of the board sent to Mr. Alder?—There was a communication accompanying the resolutions of the board, transmitted I think through Mr. Alder, signed by the President and Secretary.

330. Was that the order of the board and previously to their being laid before the Canada conference? Have you a copy of that letter and will you produce it for the information of the committee?—The communication in question was not laid before the board, nor was it, that I am aware, recognised by the board. It was written subsequently to the sitting at which the last resolutions were adopted and previous to the meeting of the conference. I signed the communication from an impression that it contained the sense of the board, though not my own individually and I so stated it to both the President and the Rev. E. Ryerson at the time, for I had from the first opposed the Union of the two conferences.

(The Witness handed in a copy of the letter marked F.)

Rev. JAMES RICHARDSON again called in and examined.

331. Have you read the Seventh Report of the Select Committee on Grievances?—I have read part of it, that which relates to the Methodists principally.

332. Have you found any thing in it relative to the church to which you belong objectionable as being erroneous or false; if so please to state the particulars?—I object first, the calling the Methodist Church an Ecclesiastical Establishment except in a spiritual sense common to all Churches organized under specific rules and forms.—I object to the phrase *official pensions* as applicable to Methodists of any description; but I do not mean to object to what I understand the meaning of the clause in which it occurs that those *official pensions* so called are derived from the public revenue raised within the Province. The British Wesleyan Methodist conference is the conference in England, which never was the Methodist Episcopal church, it therefore is incorrect to speak of it as such.

333. Is it your opinion that it is so erroneous, false or injurious to your church as to call for the animadversion and allegations against which have appeared in the Christian Guardian against the committee on Grievances and House of Assembly?—I think not as I consider its statements not so much at variance with the fact of moneys having been received from government and expended on the missions connected with the conference to which I belong as the means or channel through which they have been received and applied to said missions—I have been both grieved and surprised at the many severe and indis-



cerminate censures which have appeared against the committee on grievances, because of what they have said in the report, respecting the Methodists, as I am of opinion that a few explanations and corrections made in the spirit of candor and meekness, would have been sufficient to remove any injurious impressions arising from the errors in the report, and also thereby this unpleasant and laborious inquiry might have been uncalled for.

334. Have the Societies of the Church to which you belong been troubled or agitated about the Grants of money made by the Government to the Methodists?—They have I think to a considerable extent.

335. Did those agitations arise from the grants themselves or from misrepresentations respecting them?—No doubt misrepresentations respecting them have increased the agitation; nevertheless several of the societies within my knowledge have manifested considerable anxiety relative to those money grants, after they were correctly informed of every particular respecting them. When the report of those grants having been given appeared, I had occasion to explain at the quarterly meetings.—Those explanations relieved their minds, under an expectation that as the Canada Conference had not been made acquainted with the receipt of them, they would at their ensuing meeting disavow any participation in them and declare their adherence to their former principles relative to grants from the public funds for the support of the Christian ministry. This not being done in a satisfactory manner, this agitation to a great extent, although not so violent as at first, still continues.

336. Is it or is it not a fact that the £1,000 granted in the year 1832 or 1833 and £6,000 currency 1834, mentioned in the clause of the Grievance Report to which you object, have been received?—I believe it to be a fact that the sums mentioned in question were received, the former by the Treasurer of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee of London; the latter by the general superintendent of missions in this Province, and applied to the support of the missions connected with the conference to which I belong.

337. Do the Preachers make to your conference annual reports of the Financial as well as Spiritual concerns of their circuit?—Yes they do.

338. Are the names of any missionaries that receive pay from the funds of the Missionary society, of which the Rev. Joseph Simson is the General Superintendent, on the minutes of your conference?—Several of them. All those who are appointed by the conference are on the minutes; some stations are supplied by persons employed by the Superintendent, as occasion may arise from lack of preachers at the time of conference.

339. Does the General Superintendent report to your conference the state of the missions?—The state of the missions is presented at the conference with the state of other parts of the work.

340. Does he account to your Conference for the expenditure of monies granted by the Parent Society?—He accounts to the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London.

341. To whom does he apply for Preachers to occupy the mission stations?—The preachers are appointed to their stations by what is called the Stationing Committee, which is composed of the chairmen of districts and the superintendent of missions acting with the President of the Conference; when vacancies to the stations occur at the conference he employs such persons as may appear to him suitable, that are authorised by the church to preach.

342. Are the Chairmen of Districts allowed to exercise the same power in supplying vacancies in the circuits under their oversight?—Yes.

343. Are the missions on which the monies appropriated by the Wesleyan Missionary Committee in London are expended, regarded, in the articles of union as the Missions of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society? and do the missionaries employed in them derive any personal benefit or additional salary from the grants made by the government to that Society?—They are so regarded, —None that I know of. The Preachers connected with

our missionary work can receive no more than what is allowed them by the Missionary Committee of our church, according to the scale laid down in the discipline.

344. Do the missionaries derive their pay from the government grants made to the Parent Society, and are they members of your Conference, and can your conference, and do they from time to time through their stationing Committee appoint the preachers to these missions?—The government grants as I understand are put into the funds of the Parent Society in England and Missionaries receive their pay from those funds. The missionaries belong to our Conference. The Conference does appoint the preachers to those missions.

345. Can the superintendent employ any preachers as Missionaries but such as are approved by your Conference?—It sometimes happens that at the sitting of Conference there is not a sufficient number of preachers to supply the stations; in such cases they are supplied by the general superintendent from among such persons as he may find duly authorised to preach by the church.

346. Is the book of discipline now before you, the authorised discipline and it so is there any other edition?—It is the authorised and last edition of the discipline.

347. Have you read a section on page 14, of the 7th report of the Committee on Grievances headed "Ecclesiastical Establishments"—I have.

348. Does it not appear to you that the following clauses in that section—"This consists of four classes of the Methodists, two conferences not in connexion with each other," and "the Methodist conferences had grants extended to them for the first time in 1832, or 1833," the conference of which you are a member is meant to be included, and has it not in your opinion been generally so understood?—How it has been generally understood, I am not able to say, but it appears to me that the conference to which I belong is meant.

349. Does it not appear to you that on page 15, the clause "formerly the Methodist Episcopal Church" was inserted in order to make an impression that the monies said in the same paragraph to have been paid in 1833 and 1834 were paid to the conference of which you are a member?—and has it not the tendency to make that impression?—It appears to me that it has a tendency to that effect.

350. Have you read a paragraph on page 16 commencing with the words "this appropriation" and ending with the words "in the year 1828"?—and another immediately following it, commencing with the words "upon another occasion," and ending with the words "good understanding"?—I have read it slightly.

351.—Do you consider that by the Methodists alluded to in those paragraphs and said to be an Ecclesiastical Establishment, the Methodist conference with which you are connected is meant?—and has it not been generally so understood?—It could be understood in no other sense.

352. Do you think that the Committee on Grievances could have obtained information as to the expenditure of these monies granted by the Government if they had applied to the general Superintendent of Wesleyan Missions in Upper Canada for that information?—I have no doubt they would have obtained from him correct information had they inquired.

353. Do you mean to say that the inferences drawn in the Report on Grievances on the subject of Government grants, in relation to the Methodists and Methodist conference, are not true inferences from the public documents appended thereto?—I have not examined the report sufficiently to inform me, with respect to the correctness of the inferences drawn from the documents appended thereto.

354. Do you think that many people in this Province by reading and hearing the statements made in the Grievance Report have been led to believe that Government grants have had a corrupting influence upon the minds of the members of that conference, and have caused change in their political views?—As far as I am acquainted the statements in the Grievance Report have not in my opinion affected their minds towards the preachers of our conference.—Their views of these money grants I think were generally the same before the report was published as they now are.

## 22 Evidence to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

355. Will you explain to the committee the reason why the Missionary Superintendent of the Wesleyan Methodist Missions in this Province, if he had a particular account to give with respect to the Government monies, did not do so, when called upon for the same by the Governor, or why he has not done so to this day?—I can give no information relative to the subject contained in the question.

356. Do you think that the statements made in the Grievance Report concerning your conference are not believed by the people generally, or as far as you have an opportunity of knowing their views?—Those parts of the statements that are erroneous that may be understood to imply that Government money was paid directly to our conference—are not, as far as I have knowledge.

Committee Room.  
Monday, 4th April, 1836. }

Committee met.

The Rev. DAVID CULP, called in and examined.

357. Are you a Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Upper Canada, if so, how long have you been a minister, and have you resided constantly in the Province during the same time, and does your church still continue to be designated by that name?—I am a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church and have been for 24 years—have during that time resided in the Province.—The church to which I belong continues to be designated by that name.—I have in my possession my credentials as a minister for 20 years, having received them after 4 years officiating and travelling as such.

358. Has your church at any time received any donation or grant of money from the public funds of the Province, or have the ministers or members thereof at any time petitioned or solicited the Government for such grants?—They have never to my knowledge received any such grants, neither have they petitioned or asked for any.

359. Would it in your opinion be conducive to either the spiritual or temporal welfare, peace, or prosperity of your church to receive such grants—or would the members of your conference, or the people of your church be opposed to receive such?—I conceive that it would not be conducive to the peace, welfare, or prosperity of the church to receive such grants—as far as I understand the views of the conference to which I belong they are decidedly opposed to them, and our people are, I think, generally opposed to such grants.

360. What in your opinion has been the effect of such grants on the different denominations who have received them?—Have they produced good or evil in a religious point of view?—I ground my opinion upon the effects such grants have had upon the different denominations receiving them by comparing their state at the present according to my observation with what it used to be previously to the grants.—Before those grants were received there appeared to be peace, good will, and prosperity among the different denominations, notwithstanding the difference of opinion of creeds—since that it is not so;—there is more disorder and unpleasant feeling in the different churches, I think, since those grants have been received, than ever I knew in Canada before, though I have been resident in it all my days.

361. Have such grants produced political excitement, and to what extent? and has such excitement so produced been injurious to religion?—That they have produced a political effect or excitement is very clear in my mind, but to what extent I can hardly say, those excitements produced have been injurious to the cause of religion.

362. Do the community generally, or in any considerable number, approve of such grants, or do they disapprove of them, and would they, in your opinion, desire that they should be discontinued?—As far as my knowledge extends of the community generally, they feel decidedly opposed to any religious denominations receiving such grants—for many of the members whose ministers have received them have stated to me that they would not feel satisfied to have them continued.

363. Is the conference of which you are now a member the same to which you belonged 24 years ago?—I consider it to be the same.

364. In what way is episcopacy in your church established?—By the provision made in the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it is provided that in the case of death or vacancy in any way, or of there being no Bishop, three Elders can set apart a person to that office, which they have done.

365. Has there ever been any person known by the title of Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada?—The church has been designated and known as the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, but till recently there never having been any person fixed on, upon whom they could agree to fill that office, there had been a Bishop *pro-tempore*.

366. Have you a Bishop now who is appointed for life?—We have a Bishop now who is appointed during good behaviour, all the officers of our church are appointed on that condition.

367. When had you a Bishop *pro-tempore*, and at what time was your first Bishop appointed?—My memory does not serve me sufficiently at this time to say when a Bishop *pro-tempore* was thus appointed—I can only say that after the amicable set off from the connexion with the United States, this person was appointed; our first Bishop was appointed at our last annual conference, held in Trafalgar in June last.

368. Is he the same person who was your Bishop *pro-tempore*?—He is not.

369. Are the ministers of your conference known as itinerant preachers, or are they both itinerant and local preachers?—We have both itinerant and local preachers—but I would add that our local preachers have no seat nor vote in our annual conference.

370. Is your Bishop a local or itinerant preacher?—He is now of course considered an itinerant preacher.

371. What constitutes him an itinerant preacher?—His belonging to an itinerant connexion at present.

372. What are the duties of your itinerant preachers?—To travel and to preach the gospel as far as health and circumstances will permit.

373. What do you mean by circumstances in your answer to the last question?—I mean that there are many circumstances or casualties which might occur to prevent his travelling.

374. Are any of your itinerant preachers allowed to follow wordy calling, such as farming, merchandizing, &c.?—Yes, as much as it was allowed to St. Paul to follow tent making, at certain times.

375. In your answer to question 360, do you mean to be understood to say that no splits or dissensions took place among the Methodists prior to those grants having been made?—By no means, I willingly grant there have been splits, but to a more serious extent since the grants have been received.

367. You say that much agitation exists among different religious denominations since Government grants have been made to religious bodies—is it your opinion that such grants affect the political feeling of the denominations that receive them?—I think they do to a pretty serious extent.

Mr. JAMES. R. ARMSTRONG called in and examined.

377. Are you a member of the Methodist Society?—Yes.

378. Were you a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church previously to the union between the conference of that church and the Wesleyan Methodist conference in England?—I was.

379. Had the conference of the Methodist Episcopal church a missionary society termed the Missionary Society of the Canada conference of that church?—Yes.

380. Were you treasurer of that missionary society?—I was.

381. What is the Methodist church of which you are a member called since the union before mentioned?—The Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

382. Has the conference of that church a missionary society, and what is it called?—The Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

383. Has that society a constitution or rules by which it is regulated and managed, and can you furnish the con-

church establish-  
e of the Me-  
in the case  
being no Bish-  
office, which

own by the title  
in Canada?—  
us the Metho-  
recently there  
on whom they  
a Bishop pro-

ted for life?—  
ring good bene-  
on that

and at what  
incumbency does  
say that after  
h the United  
Bishop was  
in Trafalgar

Bishop pro-  
ee known as  
nt and local  
proachers—  
no seat nor

teacher?—He  
her.

chers?—His

preachers?—

health and

in your an-  
re many

to prevent

owed to fol-  
lizing, &c.?

to follow tent

mean to be

took place

having been

have been

grants have

among differ-

grants have

on that such

mations that

ous extent.

Examined

Society?—

Episcopal

ference of

ference M

Episcopal

ity Society

s.

Society?—

you are

ed?—The

missionary

Society of

by which

the con-

mittee with a copy of the same?—I have not been furnish-  
ed with such rules since the union.

354. Do you know how the missionary society before  
alluded to is connected with the conference of the Wes-  
leyan Methodist church in Canada, of which church you  
say you are a member?—This society is auxiliary to the  
parent society in London—there is a superintendent from  
the missionary committee in London who superintends the  
missions in this country; some of the missionaries I be-  
lieve are members of the conference.

355. Are you treasurer of that auxiliary missionary so-  
ciety?—No, not this year.

356. Have you been treasurer of the missionary society  
within the two years past?—Yes, I was treasurer until the  
last conference.

357. Was the missionary society mentioned then auxil-  
iary to the parent Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society  
in London?—I considered it so.

358. How were the monies then received by you for the  
uses of that society, and how were they accounted for?—  
I beg to hand in to the committee the best answer I can  
give to the question, the reports of the missionary society  
for the years 1834 and 1835, in which will be found the  
receipts and expenditures of all monies connected with  
the society. (For receipts and expenditures see G. & H.)

359. The committee perceive by the two reports you have  
handed in, that in that of 1834 the monies paid are ac-  
counted for in detail, and in that of 1835 they are not?—Can  
you explain the reasons of the difference?—The last re-  
port was made up when I was not at home,—I expect by  
Mr. Stinson from my books—I have no doubt but a detailed  
account was laid before the conference.

360. The committee perceive an item in the receipts of  
“Cash from the Parent Society in London drawn at dif-  
ferent times during the year 1834” £1893 1 0. Can you  
explain the nature of that transaction?—Mr. Stinson was  
in the habit of drawing on the missionary committee in  
London for money as it was required and handing the  
same over to me as treasurer to meet the demands of the  
missions.

361. Do you recollect how much of that sum was  
drawn for on London by Mr. Stinson. State if you please  
the amount as a whole, or in separate sums?—I consider  
he drew on the committee in London for the amount of  
£1893 1 0 mentioned in the report of 1834—I cannot  
say in what particular sums.

362. Did he state to you when he paid money over to  
you, as received through the Parent Society—it was mon-  
ey he had obtained by the sale of bills drawn on the  
treasurer of the Parent Society?—I do not recollect that  
he told me that particularly—I have heard him say that  
he had sold bills to different individuals, I never enquired  
particularly.

363. Do you believe the whole amount of £1893 1 0  
was money drawn for on the Parent Society in London  
by Bill of Exchange?—I have said before it was drawn  
at different times; part of it I believe was received thro’  
Mr. Marsden and paid by him as treasurer of the Missi-  
onary Society in London when he was in this country.

364. In the Christian Guardian of 27th May 1835, a  
statement headed—“Canada Conference Missionary So-  
ciety in account with James R. Armstrong, treasurer” is  
published—is that statement correct?—[The witness was  
shewn the Treasurer’s Report in the Guardian No. 289]  
(for Report see 1.)—I have no reason to doubt its cor-  
rectness as far as relates to monies that came into my  
hands.

365. In that statement appears, as having been receiv-  
ed by you, £1000 currency from the Rev. George Mars-  
den, Treasurer of the Missionary Society in London—is  
that item correct?—This refers to money paid to Mr.  
Stinson for which I cannot account.

366. Can you explain to the committee how it is that  
the two sums total of the published account in the Guardian  
of monies received, and that in the missionary re-  
port, agree except in one item of money paid to Mr. Stin-  
son?—In my report the amount is included in one sum,  
but in the paper it is divided into two items to make the  
matter more explicit.

367. Are you aware of any Government grants being  
made to the Parent Society of the Missionary Society of  
your church and under what authority were they made?  
—I know nothing except from report.

368. Do you approve of such grants being made and  
for such purposes?—As I considered this grant was made  
for the benefit of the Indians, I can find no fault with it,  
inasmuch as the moneys paid arose from the sales of the  
lands which once belonged to them, as I consider they  
did.

369. Do you believe that this is the general opinion of  
the ministers of your church and of the conference of  
your church?—It is impossible for me to say how far  
that opinion extends.

400. Would you approve of Government grants being  
given for missionary purposes to the Catholic church  
among the Indians?—If they should expend the grant in  
the education of the Indians in reading, &c., I have no  
objection.

401. Do you believe it is only right and proper for the  
Government to grant for missionary purposes to the Wes-  
leyan Methodist Church?—I think my answer to the last  
question answers this.

402. Do you think that Government has not a right to  
bestow its bounty for missionary purposes on any relig-  
ious sect and society it may choose to select for the pur-  
pose?—It is not for me to dictate to Government the  
manner it shall distribute grants for missionary purposes;  
and where moneys are judiciously laid out in civilizing  
the Indians, I do not object to any religious body being  
the agent for that purpose.

403. Are you of opinion a missionary society of any  
church can teach christianity, or do you believe christi-  
anity consists in any set of religious opinions?—I be-  
lieve that many christian societies can teach christianity.

404. Was any part of the amount drawn through Mr.  
Marsden from moneys granted by the Government to the  
Parent Society?—I think I have said that Mr. Stinson  
drew on Mr. Marsden as treasurer for the Missionary So-  
ciety in London for part of the moneys received from the  
Parent Society.

REV. Mr. EVANS again called in and examined.

405. Do you approve of grants by Government being  
made to the Parent Society of the Missionary Society of  
your church for missionary purposes?—I think it is per-  
fectly right for the Government to make such disposition  
for missionary purposes of any moneys which are consti-  
tutionally at its disposal as may be in its opinion most  
conducive to the interests of those who are destitute of  
religious instruction when by so doing the salary of no  
preacher would be augmented or his personal interest  
promoted.

406. Do you think that this is a general opinion among  
the members, lay and ecclesiastical of your church?—I am  
not aware that any member of our church would be oppos-  
ed to the government making such appropriations for mis-  
sionary purposes as are in accordance with its constitu-  
tional powers, and the expenditure of which would promote the  
spiritual and eternal interests of mankind without augment-  
ing the regular disciplinary allowance of any preacher; but  
I believe that the whole of them as well as myself would  
strongly disapprove of any Government grant being re-  
ceived under circumstances that would tend in any degree to  
the temporal aggrandizement of the preachers, by enabling  
them to receive any, even the smallest salary over and  
above the regular allowance made by the discipline, be-  
cause, if received under such circumstances it might exert  
a corrupting influence upon the preachers, and induce men  
to enter the ministry from motives of pecuniary gain and  
without that due regard to the good of souls by which alone  
the christian ministry ought to be actuated.

407. Do you approve of Government grants of money  
made for missionary purposes being devoted to the payment  
of salaries to the members of your conference or such  
preachers not members of your conference employed by  
your church as missionaries?—I can see no impropriety in  
the committee of the Parent Society and whose direction

## 24 Evidence to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

the Wesleyan Missions in this Province are placed receiving grants from the Government, if made as above stated from funds constitutionally at its disposal, or in their faithfully appropriating them with their other funds according to the best of their judgment to the promotion of the spiritual interests of those who are under their pastoral care and direction. I am however of opinion that more than the amount received from the Government has been appropriated to education and other purposes in the mission work without including the payment of preachers salaries.

Rev. JAMES RICHARDSON again called in and examined.

408. Having been much in attendance in this committee at its first sittings, have you seen any thing that can justify the animadversions on in the Editorial of the Christian Guardian of last week, No. 333 and of this week relative to the proceedings of this committee?—I was not present on the first day of the sitting of the committee but was part of the second day and several times since, and from what has come within my knowledge, the inquiry of the committee, although multifarious, close and searching, have not been in any way secret, but open and candid; and as far as I am concerned they have been courteous.

409. What is your opinion relative to the tendency of those animadversions?—I think they tend to mislead the public mind relative to the proceeding and character of this committee as far as my knowledge extends.

410. Were you present when the committee concluded examining Mr. Case, did you hear him complain then or since of the treatment by the committee?—I have not heard him complain, but I heard him thank the committee for their courtesy towards him or to that effect.

411. What is your opinion of government grants made for missionary purposes to the parent society of the missionary society of your church?—I have been for some years of the opinion that the only proper mode, (consistent with the purity, peace and unity of religious societies,) of supplying pecuniary aid to religious institutions whether missionary or others, is the voluntary contributions of individuals from their private or personal resources.

412. Do you believe the whole of your conference would approve of the missionary members of your conference, or any preachers employed by your conference, not its members, as missionaries receiving salaries, or any degree of compensation for religious services from such a source?—I do not approve of it, and I believe several members of the conference to which I belong disapprove as well as myself.

413. What is the opinion of the lay-members of your church on the same subject so far as your knowledge extends?—To my certain knowledge, both the preachers and the members of the church to which I belong were, a few years since, almost unanimously opposed to receiving aid from the public funds, for any of their religious institutions. I recollect at the conference of 1829 a motion was made to apply to the Legislature of the province for a grant of £500 to aid our missions among the Indians which was decidedly opposed, being only supported, I believe, by the mover and second, and the members of our church have not, to my knowledge, given any indication of a change of opinion on the subject, except it be in very few cases.

414. Do you recollect your conference in one of its sessions, adopting and forwarding a memorial to the King, deprecating an established church in Upper Canada, and also recommending that all religious teachers, preachers, and ministers be left to the voluntary support of their own churches?—I do in the session of 1831.

415. Was that the memorial that called forth the well-known reply of Sir John Colborne, late Lieutenant Governor, to the application of the committee of your conference to his Excellency to lay it at the foot of the throne?—It was.

The committee met.

Thursday, 7th April, 1836.

JOHN WILLSON, Esquire, of Saltfleet, called in and examined.

416. Are you aware of any grants of money being made

by government for religious purposes to different sects of Christians in this province?—I am.

417. Do you know what these purposes are, and under what authority were the grants made?—I know that in 1833 I made application to the Lieutenant-Governor for a grant of money for the Canadian Wesleyan Methodists; the authority for the grant as far as I know was from the Lieutenant-Governor by order of the Home Government. The application of the money was to be for the benefit of the preachers, but in communications which I afterwards received from the government-office, it was stated it was for the building of churches & chapels. In the year 1834 application was made by me in favor of the said society. A year. In the year 1833 a part of the money granted was paid by me towards the building of certain chapels and the remainder was paid over to a committee of the conference. In the year 1834 the sum was paid over towards the erection of chapels, and a sum of \$300 or thereabouts was reserved towards building a chapel in Toronto which was afterwards abandoned.

418. Do you think it is the wish of the Canadian Wesleyan Methodists to have the grants continued?—As it was made I desire to rehearse to the committee the grant was first formed then by me towards the building of certain chapels and the portion of money being at their disposal. I stated to them distinctly that the moneys given to the several religious denominations were taken out of the casual and territorial revenue a fund at the disposal of the crown by prerogative right, and while it so remained that they (the Canadian Wesleyan) might very fairly avail themselves of the royal benevolence in receiving it; but that it was my opinion it would be better this fund were transferred to the control of the Provincial Legislature which could only be done by negotiating for it; as was the case with the proceeds of the assembly in a proper shape and be disposed of in an amicable way during my time of service therein I would give my most cordial support. The subject of religious grants being made a matter of discussion in the Canadian Wesleyan conference in its Session of 1835, a vote passed in the negative at my instance.

419. Can you inform the committee on what grounds the Conference of the Canadian Wesleyan Methodists declined applying for any further grants?—One reason was that the preachers said the people in some places would not come to hear them in consequence of the Conference having received the grant. Another was that the people did not contribute with their usual generosity; and thirdly that there could not be a satisfactory distribution made of it.

420. Do you know of any grants of money being made by the Government for the missionary purposes of any religious body?—In the communications from the Government office to me it was stated that there was a certain sum to the British Wesleyan Conference, and a certain sum to the Canadian Wesleyan Conference, and an exact copy of which I believe is in the Seventh Report on Grievances.

421. What effect had the grants on the peace & harmony of the Canadian Wesleyan church, and did they answer the purposes you anticipated when you first applied for them, or do you think they generally advanced the religious interests of that society?—I acknowledge they did not produce satisfaction, the reasons for which I have stated in a former answer.

422. In your answer to question No. 417, you say a part of the money received by you from Government was paid over to a committee appointed by the conference, do you know to what purpose the committee applied the money so paid over by you?—I cannot tell as vouchers for applications are not in my possession.

423. Were any directions given by you to said committee with respect to the application of said money?—No, not by me.

424. Was there any given to it by the conference?—I really do not know what directions the conference might have given.

425. In the seventh report of the committee on grievances there are certain resolutions purporting to be the resolutions of the Canadian Wesleyan Conference, are these

different sects of

are, and, under  
I know that in  
nt Governor for a  
n Methodist; the  
as from the Lieut.  
Government. The  
the benefit of the  
I afterwards re-  
stated it was for  
ear 1834 applica-  
said society. A  
in the preceding  
ney granted was  
chapels and the  
of the conference.  
wards the erec-  
reabouts was re-  
onto which was

Canadian Wes-  
?—As it was  
grant was first  
n the purport of  
at the time I in-  
al, I stated to  
to several religi-  
asual and terror-  
by prero-  
es of the Canadian  
of the royal  
my opinion it  
be the control of  
by re-  
ceeds of the  
before the As-  
f in an amica-  
I would give  
ligious grants  
ond an Wes-  
ote passed in

at grounds the  
thodists decli-  
ason was that  
ces would not  
ference hav-  
ne people did  
did thirdly that  
made of it.

being made  
of any reli-  
Government  
ertain sum  
tain sum to  
copy of which  
ces.

se & harmony  
y answer the  
ed for them,  
religious in-  
did not pro-  
ove stated in

ou any part  
nt was paid  
ence, do you  
d the money  
for applica-

committee  
o, not by me.  
ference?—I  
ence might

e on griev-  
e be the re-  
e, are these

resolutions correct and if so were they complied with by your conference?—They have been consulted with the money has been paid agreeably to the resolution, the sum set apart towards the building a chapel in Toronto was the next year together with the interest thereon, applied towards other chapels.

426. Has your society a chapel in Peterboro'?—I do not know, I know they have a lot there and said was sent to build a chapel but I am not aware that one has been built, or is building.

427. You have said there were £17 expended on a young man who was sent as a preacher to Toronto, was that paid to him as his salary?—By no means, in lieu of or as a part of Mr. Flanagan's salary, as I believe that no Methodist conference makes itself liable for the salary of any preacher on any circuit or station, on the general plan not being a mission, I did myself assume the responsibility as he was sent to this place and appeared to have no visible means, nor any place for public worship, and I procured for him through the politeness of the sheriff the use of the court-house which however he did not use, the money was paid by me at different times, and a small sum to get a contractor to relinquish his contract for building a chapel entered into by Mr. Flanagan, who, in conjunction with Mr. Bamford strove hard afterwards to get from me a further sum of £20 to 25 of said money; but, by that time, I suspected one or both of having fallen under the influence of the Rev. Egerton Ryerson, and which afterwards proved to be the case.

428. Did you inform the conference from what funds those grants were derived and by what authority they were made?—I stated that they were derived from the casual and territorial revenue and by the authority of His Majesty's Government.

429. Have you considered such grants to have been given for the special benefit of Indian Missionaries only?—Not such grants as I have been speaking of, such was never contemplated by the grants to the Canadian Wesleyans.

#### COMMITTEE ROOM.

SATURDAY, 9th APRIL, 1836.

Committee met.

REV. JOSEPH STINSON, called in and examined.

430. Are you superintendent of the missions of the British Wesleyan Conference in this Province?—I am.

431.—Will you be good enough to state to the committee how you are appointed to that station?—I am appointed by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England.

432. Is there a Missionary Society in this Province attached to the Wesleyan Methodist Church of the same, and it is auxiliary to the Parent Society in London?—There is a Missionary Society in connexion with the Methodist Conference in this Province, which Missionary Society is auxiliary to the Wesleyan Missionary Society in England.

433. Will you be good enough to state to the committee how the missionaries employed by that Society are appointed to their work?—They are appointed by the Canada Conference.

434. Are they in any manner under your superintendence, and will you be good enough to state the extent and authority of that superintendence?—I beg to refer the committee to the articles of union between the Canada and English conference, as an answer to the question.

435. Will you be good enough to inform the committee what authority the Parent Missionary Society in England exercises over the Canada Conference Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church?—I know of no authority it exercises except that which is stated in the articles of union.

438. Are you aware of any Government grants being made for the support of Wesleyan Methodist Missionaries in Upper Canada?—I know that a grant of that description was made to the Wesleyan Methodist society in London for the support of Wesleyan Methodist Missions in Upper Canada.

437. Were those grants made unsolicited, or were they applied for by the Parent Missionary Society in this Pro-

vince?—I believe they were made without any solicitation whatever.

431. What amount was received, and how was it expended?—I beg to make the following statement as my answer

Account of Receipts and Disbursements of moneys received from Government on account of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in London.  
For the Years 1833, 1834 and 1835.

Dr.

Oct'r 9th 1833, By cash from the Rev. Geo. Marsden one of the General Treasurers of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, London, .....	1000	0	0
July 1st 1834, By cash from the Hon. John Henry Dunn, Receiver General, on behalf of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, London, .....	611	2	24
Currency £	1611	2	24

Cr.

CREDIT MISSION.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
To paid Mrs. Cook, school teacher, .....	35	0	0			
To paid Mr. Nankerville as do., .....	35	0	0			
To repairing mission house, .....	41	4	2			
To stationery for schools, .....	2	11	74			
To paid Rev. F. Jones salary for two years, .....	100	0	0			
				213	15	94
LAKE SIMCOE MISSION.						
To paid Miss Manwaring, school teacher, two years salary, .....	65	0	0			
To paid do. travelling expenses, .....	1	10	0			
To paid Mr. Maffit Ass't teacher, .....	17	0	0			
To paid John Simpson, native exhorter, .....	43	0	0			
To paid John Snake, interpreter, two years, .....	36	0	0			
To paid B. Crane, do., .....	25	0	0			
To paid for stationery for school, .....	0	10	5			
				188	0	5
RICE LAKE MISSION.						
To paid Miss Penny, school teacher, two years, .....	56	5	0			
To paid for repairing school house, .....	2	0	6			
To paid building chapel and repairing mission house, .....	140	8	5			
To paid for furniture for mission house, .....	1	10	0			
To paid for books for school, .....	2	7	9			
To paid for clothing and boarding 4 Indian boys, .....	7	4	0			
To paid John Simpson, native exhorter, .....	42	10	0			
				261	5	6
MUNCY TOWN MISSION.						
To paid Thos. Hurlburt, school teacher, .....	43	0	0			
To paid Miss Adams part of two years, .....	48	6	8			
To paid do. do. travelling expenses, .....	4	12	6			
To paid Geo. Henry, interpreter, .....	37	10	0			
To paid other interpreters, Cornego, &c., .....	14	9	4			
To paid for building materials for school house, .....	10	0	0			
To paid for books for do., .....	1	7	11			
				159	6	5
GRAPE ISLAND MISSION.						
To paid Tho's Hurlburt, school teacher two years, .....	125	0	0			
To paid John Sundry two years, .....	100	0	0			
				225	0	0



	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
<b>GRAND RIVER MISSION.</b>						
To paid John McEwin, school teacher.....	35	0	0			
To paid Moses Walker, native exhorter two years.....	75	0	0			
To paid John Doxlaster, native exhorter two years.....	26	5	0			
To paid Joseph Doxlaster, interpreter two years.....	26	5	0			
To paid for materials for new school house.....	13	0	0			
To paid Miss Hurlburt, school teacher.....	30	0	0			
To paid for furniture for mission house.....	4	10	0			
To paid for printing rules in Indian.....	1	5	0			
To paid for books for schools.....	0	15	0	212	0	0
<b>MOHAWK MISSION.</b>						
To paid Mr. Johnson, teacher.....	31	6	0			
To paid for glass, nails, &c. for dwelling house.....	1	8	0			
To paid Mr. Mafit, school teacher.....	10	0	0	42	14	0
<b>ST. CLAIR MISSION.</b>						
To paid for repairing of mission buildings.....	9	14	6			
To paid T. McGee, interpreter.....	37	10	0			
To paid do. family travelling expenses.....	6	5	0			
To paid other interpreters and exhorters.....	13	2	11	66	12	5
<b>SANGEENG MISSION.</b>						
To paid D. Sawyer, interpreter.....	40	0	0			
To paid do. do.....	17	10	0			
To paid do. travelling expenses.....	2	17	6.			
To paid Mr. Hurlburt, teacher.....	62	10	0			
To paid do. travelling expenses.....	3	7	6			
To paid for freightage of sundry articles.....	2	6	0			
To paid for building materials, glass, nails, &c.....	1	4	7	129	15	7
<b>CONTINGENCIES.</b>						
To paid for tuition of Henry Steenhour at Cazenovia two years.....	57	0	0			
To paid for stoves for mission house.....	11	5	0			
To paid for printing Indian discipline, &c.....	11	0	0			
To paid for furniture for mission houses.....	17	4	3			
Te paid expenses of native exhorters to L. Nipissing.....	5	0	0			
To paid for stationery for schools.....	11	2	8	112	11	11
				£	1611	2 24

439. Were any of the moneys granted by the Government paid to any of the members of the Canadian Conference, excepting native preachers?—No part of those grants was paid to any members of the Conference, but native preachers.

440. Were you ever required before this either by the Government of this Province or the Legislature thereof, to account for the expenditure of these moneys?—I was not required to give such account, the Parent Society makes the account to the Government, and I account to the Parent Society.

REV. J. FLANAGAN, *called in and examined.*

441. Were you formerly a member of the conference of the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Church?—I was.

442. Were you Secretary of that conference at any time?—I was.

443. Have you any knowledge of certain grants of money having been made to that conference, and if so will you please to state the amount, and for what purposes they were granted?—There were certain grants made to that conference in the years 1833 and 1834, the sum granted in 1833 was £600 sterling, and in the year 1834 £350 sterling, they were granted for the purpose of buildings in the Province.

444. Can you inform the committee in what manner the first grant of £600 sterling was expended?—There were £320 or £80 paid to the Rev. James Jackson for his claims on the conference, the resolution of the conference ordering the payment of this sum was as follows:

*Resolved*—That there be granted to Elder Jackson, of the funds of the conference, the sum of £55, on account of all his claims to this date. (June 1833).

The sum of £25 was paid to the Rev. David Breakenridge, and the like sum to Elder Jackson, as part of their salaries in advance, making the whole sum paid to Mr. Jackson that year £80.

The sum of about £300 was paid to Dr. McKenzie, or the printing committee, for the printing establishment.

The rest, as far as my knowledge extends, was given for the purpose of chapels.

445. What were the claims of Elder Jackson, which you mentioned in your former answer which were named in the resolution, and from what source were the funds of the conference derived?—His claims were for salary as minister to the connexion, the money obtained from the Government was the only fund at the command of the conference except about \$54 which I brought to the conference.

Moved and carried, that there be paid in advance to each of the missionaries or agents of the printing establishment the sum of £25.

Moved and carried that all the monies in the hands of brother John Willson, to and for the use of our people and at the disposal of the conference be paid by him to the order of the Printing Office.

446. In the seventh report of the committee on grievances there is a document bearing your signature as Secretary of the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Conference, purporting to be the resolutions passed by that conference, directing the manner in which any grant that might be made by His Majesty's Government that year should be expended, is that document correct?—This is correct.

447. Was any money granted that year by the Government to that conference, and if so was it expended in the manner directed in those resolutions?—There was as before stated; and it was applied for the purposes mentioned except the sum of £20, which was paid to Mr. Jackson. The Trustees of the London, St. Thomas and Vienna chapels, signed receipts in full for the whole amount they were to receive, at the same time, giving between them to the Rev. James Jackson, the above sum of £20, the sum of either £15 or £17 was likewise given to me towards the establishing a mission in this city.

448. In your reply to question 445, it appears that part of the grant was paid to Elder Jackson as a missionary, what was the nature of that mission?—The nature of it was to collect debts due to the printing establishment, for the paper called the "Canadian Wesleyan," he acted as agent for the printing committee.

**APPENDIX**  
TO THE  
**REPORT AND EVIDENCE**  
TAKEN BY THE  
**Select Committee**  
ON  
**GOVERNMENT GRANTS.**

**A**  
**ARTICLES OF UNION.**

The English Wesleyan Conference, concurring in the communication of the Canadian Conference and deprecating the evils which might arise from collision, and believing that the cause of religion generally, and the interests of Methodism in particular, would, under the blessing of God, be greatly promoted by the united exertions of the two connexions; considering also, that the two bodies concur in holding the doctrines of Methodism as contained in the Notes of Mr. Wesley on the New Testament, and in his four volumes of Sermons, do agree in the adoption of the following Resolutions:—

1st. That such a union between the English and Canadian connexions, as shall preserve inviolate the rights and privileges of the Canadian Preachers and societies on the one hand, and, on the other, shall secure the funds of the English conference against any claims on the part of the Canadian Preachers, is highly important and desirable.

2nd. That [as proposed in the second and third resolutions of the Canadian conference] in order to effect this object, the Discipline, Economy, and form of church Government in general of the Wesleyan Methodists in England be introduced into the societies in Upper Canada, and that in particular an annual Presidency be adopted.

3rd. That the usages of the English conference, in reference to the probation, examination and admission of candidates into the Itinerant Ministry, be adopted.\*

4th. That Preachers who have travelled the usual term of probation and are accepted, by the Canadian conference shall be ordained by the imposition of the hands of the President, and of three or more of the Senior Preachers, according to the form contained in Mr. Wesley's "Sunday morning service of the Methodists," by which the Wesleyan Missionaries in England are ordained, and which is the same as the form of ordaining Elders in the Discipline of the Canadian conference.

5th. That the English conference shall have authority to send from year to year, one of its own body to preside over the Canadian conference; but the same person shall not be appointed oftener than once in four years, unless at the request of the Canadian conference.—When the English conference does not send a President from England, the Canadian conference shall, on its assembling choose one of its own members.

The proposal of the Canadian conference is understood to include, as a matter of course, that the President of the conference shall exercise the same functions generally as the present general Superintendent now actually exercises; he shall not however have authority to appoint any Preacher to any circuit or station, contrary to the counsel, and advice of a majority of the chairmen of District or Presiding Elders, associated with him as a stationing committee.

6th. That the Missions among the Indian tribes and

destitute settlers which are now, or may be hereafter, established in Upper Canada, shall be regarded as Missions of the English Wesleyan Missionary Society under the following regulations:—

First.—The Parent Committee in London shall determine the amount to be applied annually to the support and extension of the Missions; and this sum shall be distributed by a committee consisting of the President, General Superintendent of the missions, the chairman of districts and seven other persons appointed by the Canadian conference. A standing Board or committee consisting of an equal number of Preachers and Lay-men, shall moreover be appointed as heretofore at every conference, which during the year, shall have authority in concurrence with the General Superintendent of missions, to apply any moneys granted by the Parent Committee and not distributed by the conference in establishing new missions among the heathen, and and otherwise promoting the Missionary work.

Second.—The Methodist Missionary Society in Upper Canada shall be auxiliary to the English Wesleyan Missionary Society and the moneys raised by it shall be paid into the funds of the parent society.

Third.—The Missionaries shall be stationed at the Canada conference in the same way as the other preachers; with this proviso, however, that the general superintendent of missions shall be associated with the president and chairmen of districts in their appointment.

Fourth.—All the preachers who may be sent from this country into the work in Upper Canada shall be members of the Canadian Conference and shall be placed under the same discipline, and be entitled to the same rights and privileges as the native preachers.\*

Fifth.—Instead of having the annual stations of the missionaries sent home to the English Missionary Committee and conference for their "sanction," as is the case with our missions generally, and as the Canadian Conference have proposed, the English Conference shall appoint, and the parent committee shall meet the expense of supporting a general superintendent of missions, as the agent of the committee shall have the same superintendence of the mission stations, as the chairman of districts or presiding Elders exercise over the circuits in their respective districts, and shall pay the missionaries their allowance as determined by the Conference Missionary Committee on the same scale as the Canadian book of Discipline lays down for the preachers on the regular circuits:—but who, being at the same time recognized as a member of the Canadian conference shall be accountable to it in regard of his religious and moral conduct. This General Superintendent of missions representing the parent committee in the Canadian conference, and in the stationing and missionary committees, the appointments of the missionaries at the conference shall be final.

7th.—That the Canadian Conference in legislating for its own members, or the connexion at large, shall not at any time make any regulation which shall infringe these articles of agreement between the two conferences.

Signed by order and on behalf of the conference.

RICHARD TREFFRY, *President.*

EDMOND GRINDROD, *Secretary.*

Manchester, August 7th, 1833.

*Resolved.*—That the Canadian Conference cordially concurs in the resolution of the British Conference, dated "Manchester, August 7th, 1833," as the basis of union between the two conferences.

EGBERTON RYERSON, *Secretary.*

York, U. C. October 2nd, 1833.

\* This is understood both by the Canadian Conference and the Representatives from the British Conference to refer to no other modifications in the economy of Methodism in Upper Canada, than those which have taken place at this Conference and that the Canadian Book of Discipline has heretofore provided for.

\* The understanding of this article is that the Canadian Conference shall employ such young men in Upper Canada as they may judge are called of God, into the itinerant work; but should not a sufficient number be found in Upper Canada properly qualified, the British Conference will send out as many young men from England as may be requested by the Canadian Conference.

**B**  
GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
Toronto, 30th June, 1835. }

Sir,

I am directed by the Lieutenant Governor to acquaint you with reference to your letter of the 22nd instant, that the sums granted in aid of the different churches in Canada were all sanctioned, in consequence of petitions to His Majesty's Government—and at the time the appropriation alluded to in your communication was made, His Majesty's Government supported the Wesleyan Methodists in this Province were under the control of the British conference.

For any further information you may require on the subject I am directed to refer you to the correspondence which was laid before the House of Assembly last session.

I am, &c.

A true Copy.

ROWAN.

**C**

*Extracts from Minutes of Committee held May 11th 1831.*

Mr. Ryerson, from Upper Canada, accompanied by the Rev. Peter Jones, a converted Indian Chief, were introduced to the Committee, having statements to make, and arrangements to propose, respecting the prosecution of the Missions in that Province, and especially among the Indian Tribes. After hearing their statements, and considering what might be the probable effects of their plans on their own Missions and missionary subscriptions it was—

Resolved 1st.—That Mr. Turner be immediately written to, to enquire respecting the facilities which may exist as to the commencement of a Mission to the Indians in Upper Canada among such tribes as have not yet been visited by missionaries, such mission having been long contemplated.

2nd. That a grant of the sum of three hundred pounds be made to Messrs. Ryerson and Jones for the use of the Missions already commenced among the Indians by the Canadian Methodist body; as a proof of christian and brotherly affection to our Canadian brethren.

3rd. That in consequence of this grant, the brethren Ryerson and Jones have agreed and will be expected to give their best assistance to our friends at such meetings as they may have opportunity of attending while they remain in England without making private and personal applications for subscriptions to any of our own friends.

London, Wesleyan Mission House, }  
June 13th, 1835. }

The Rev. Wm. CASE,  
&c. &c. &c.

DEAR BROTHER:

At the instance of the missionary committee, I now transmit to you a copy of the resolutions entered into by them, on the introduction of Messrs. Ryerson and Jones, and receiving their statements relative to your missions and the object of the visit of the deputation to England. They rejoiced to receive them as brethren, and sincerely congratulated them on the success with which your missionaries have been favored, by the blessing of God, among the native tribes of Indians. An impression deep, affectionate and highly favorable to the Indian mission has been made by the addresses of Brother Jones at our own and several other public meetings of a benevolent character, as well as by the amiableness, intelligence and piety of his general intercourse with ourselves and our friends in different places. We exceedingly regret the severe indisposition by which he has for some weeks been prevented from more generally visiting our societies in other parts of the kingdom, but from which, we are thankful to hear he is now recovering and are therefore hoping that he will soon be in a state of convalescence. During his sickness which occurred at Bristol, and which there is reason to believe originated in a violent cold taken by travelling on the outside of the coach from Liverpool to London immediately after his arrival, he has been at the house of a most kind

and attentive friend, Mr. James Wood, jun. son of our venerable brother the Rev. James Wood, where he has received every medical and domestic attention. Mr. Ryerson, who resides at the mission house continues in good health.

From the annexed "Resolutions" you will observe that the committee have decided upon commencing their long contemplated mission to the Indians, convinced that where the field is so wide there need be no fear of any unpleasant or conflicting feelings among the missionaries who may be employed. The idea was suggested to your deputation whether it would be agreeable to you to place the whole of your Indian missions under our direction, as we might perhaps succeed in raising funds for a greater extent of missionary operation that could be at present raised by yourselves; but as they seemed to think the proposal would not be accepted, they resolved to shew their brotherly kindness and interest in the success of the mission to the aborigines of America, by a donation of £300 to which they were the more readily induced by a wish to accomplish a part of the object of your deputation, which they understood to be that of raising funds by soliciting subscriptions and donations, but which they were aware could not be done in addition to the applications of their own preachers and friends without some danger of painful collision. They were happy to find the proposal met the approbation of both Messrs. Ryerson and Jones, who consequently agreed not to make application to any of our own friends, reserving the liberty of applying to those of other denominations, who were not contributors to our own funds. They also agreed to assist at any public meetings we might wish them to attend during their stay in this country, all travelling expenses being borne by the missionary committee.

You will also perceive by the above "Resolutions," that whilst the committee desire to manifest the most cordial affection to their American Brethren and entertain a sincere wish for the prosperity of their missions, they feel themselves obliged to state their conviction that applications from other quarters to the Societies in England would be both injurious to their own funds and involve the connexion in unpleasant party disputes, and consequently, that in case of any future attempt to raise such contributions from our friends, they would regard it as an imperative duty to discountenance them.

Your official letter will, in course, agreeably to your desire be transmitted to the President, to be laid before the ensuing conference, from whom you will most probably receive a reciprocation of friendly and brotherly communion.

In the mean time—I am,  
On the behalf of the Wesleyan Missionary Committee,  
Your affectionate Brother in the Gospel,  
JAMES TOWNLEY,  
Secretary.

By order of the conference the resolutions of the London Methodist Missionary Committee held the 11th May, and the accompanying letter from the Rev. Dr. Townley, dated London, Wesleyan Mission House, June 13th, 1831, addressed to the Rev. Wm. Case, were taken into consideration, after carefully considering the several subjects referred to in these documents, it was resolved—

1. It is a matter of thankfulness to Almighty God and to our Methodist brethren in England, that Messrs. Ryerson and Jones have been kindly received and entertained in their mission to Great Britain; and that the addresses and intercourse of Mr. Jones have produced upon the public mind in that country "an impression deep, affectionate and highly favourable" to the cause of missions.

2. That it affords us much pleasure to learn that our Methodist brethren in Great Britain feel a deep interest in the christianization and improvement of the aborigines of British North America.

3. That our sincere thanks be given to the Methodist missionary committee in London for the grant of three hundred pounds in aid of our Indian Missions.

4. That we learn with deepest regret that in a measure which so seriously concerns the interest of the Methodist

son of our ve-  
ere he has re-  
Mr. Ryer-  
tines in good

ill observe that  
being their long  
ence that where  
any unpleasant  
re who may be  
therly kindness  
the whole of  
we might per-  
ext of mission-  
by your-  
ness would not  
therly kindness  
the aborigines  
which they were  
nplish a part of  
nderstood to be  
ions and dona-  
be done in ad-  
ers and friends  
they were hap-  
of both Messrs.  
not to make  
ing the liberty  
who were not  
agreed to assist  
to attend dur-  
xpense being

solutions," that  
most cordial  
ertain a sin-  
ons, they feel  
that applica-  
England would  
olve the con-  
sequently, that in  
tributions from  
relative duty to

ly to your de-  
aid before the  
not probably re-  
rely communi,

Committee,  
in the Gospel,  
NLEY,  
Secretary.

s of the Lon-  
the 11th May,  
Dr. Townley,  
the 13th, 1831,  
into consid-  
sub-jects re-

ty God and to  
ers. Ryerson  
ntained in  
addressee and  
on the public  
affectionate

seem that our  
up interesting  
aborigines of

the Methodist  
ant of three  
on a measure  
ke Methodist

connexion in Upper Canada, our missionary operations in particular, and the honor of Methodism and cause of religion generally, our brethren of the London Methodist Missionary Committee have, without consulting their Methodist brethren in Upper Canada, determined to establish a mission among us, separate from our connexion.

5. That the formation of a distinct Methodist society or societies in Upper Canada, by the London Methodist Missionary Committee is contrary to the understanding which has hitherto been given by the English conference that their missionaries should not form societies separate from ours in Upper Canada; whilst at the same time our Missionaries were not to interfere with the arrangements or operations of their missions in Lower Canada.

6. That it would be a matter of very deep regret should the Methodist Missionary Committee in London determine to establish a mission in Upper Canada among any of the Indian tribes situated north and east of Lake Huron, as all these parts of the Province are embraced within the actual labours of our conference; as our own missionaries have with greater or less success, visited all these tribes, and we have established missions or regular missionary appointments among them all;—as no missionary society beyond the Atlantic can possess the same facilities without doing an equal amount of good with the same means;—as the formation of a Methodist society in Upper Canada, distinct from that already established is a disavowal of the already recognized principle that "the Wesleyan Methodists are one in every part of the world"; it will in all probability produce serious misunderstandings and party disputes in our connexion;—make unfavorable impressions upon the minds of the Indians, by attempts at forming distinct societies of professedly the same people among them;—and do material injury to our missionary funds in this Province.

7. That if the Methodist Missionary Committee in London shall determine to establish a mission or missions among any of the numerous Indian tribes west or north of the Lake Huron, or in the vicinity of Hudson's Bay, we will do all in our power to assist them, by furnishing them with Indian translations of the Gospel, Hymns, &c. and native labourers as far as we can possibly spare them.

# TO THE REV. DR. TOWNLEY, &c. &c. &c.

Rev. and dear Brother,

Your letter of the 13th of June last to the Rev. William Case and the annexed Resolutions of your missionary committee of the 11th May, were submitted to the conference at its late Session; and after the general sense of the conference was taken on the subjects embraced in your communication, the whole business was referred to the missionary Board to communicate with you. Agreeably to the direction of the Board we now transmit to you a copy of the Resolutions adopted by them on these subjects.

By the annexed resolutions you will perceive that due feelings of gratitude are entertained by the Board to our Brethren in Great Britain for their kind attentions to Messieurs Ryerson and Jones, and to your committee for their expression of good will towards our interesting and flourishing Indian missions in Upper Canada. The Board cherish the highest respect and warmest affection for their Brethren on the other side of the Atlantic, viewing the Methodists in England and in Upper Canada as two Branches of the same family and subjects of the same government.

But considering all the circumstances of Mr. Jones' mission, and the apprehensions entertained that applications to the British public from the Methodist Missionary Society in Upper Canada, would "involve your connexion in unpleasant party disputes," his deputation to England as far as it relates to any applications to your contributors, has been regretted by the Board. You may rest assured that these circumstances were altogether unforeseen by our General Superintendent of Missions when the deputation was determined upon. We should be sorry indeed to be even the remotest instruments of doing any thing that would in the least degree disturb the peace of your connexion, or affect your missionary funds, so deservedly wanted throughout the

H

vastly extended fields of your numerous and valuable missions.

It may, however, be remarked by way of explanation, that Mr. Jones' mission to England was undertaken at the suggestion and recommendation of a number of intelligent and respectable English brethren, who stated their conviction that more guineas would be given in England in aid of our Indian missions than dollars in the United States, where a deputation from our society was once sent, and was assisted by the Methodist brethren in different cities and towns in that country to make collections to the amount of several hundred pounds. Our conference being an independent connexion in a British province, our Indian missions established within the British territories, a preference was, of course, felt to making applications to the British public. And lest any method should be adopted by our deputation which might interfere with your interests and operations, they were instructed to call upon your committee for their advice. It is hoped, however, that, from the arrangements entered into between our deputation and your committee, Mr. Jones' mission may, upon the whole, have a favorable influence upon the funds of your own society.—And no future deputation to England is contemplated by the Board, unless the measures adopted by your committee should so far affect our missionary funds and operations in Canada, as to render further explanations and applications to the British public advisable and necessary.

The fourth, fifth and sixth of the accompanying resolutions were entered into by the Board in order to apprise your committee of the views and circumstances of our connexion relative to a part of the missionary field in Canada. The success of our Indian missions, considering the means expended, has, perhaps, not a parallel in the history of modern missions. This extraordinary and continued blessing of God upon the labors of our society, is considered a peculiar call of Providence to continue them in all our mission stations, and to all those tribes which our missionaries have visited. Indeed, the rapid progress of Methodism in Upper Canada generally appears to indicate more clearly, that our present ecclesiastical arrangements, whilst purely Wesleyan, are remarkably well adapted to the work of "spreading scriptural holiness throughout" the land, and that the abandonment of them would be stepping aside from the order of divine Providence.

By the seventh resolution annexed, you will perceive the readiness and anxiety of the Board to co-operate with your committee in their contemplated mission to Canada, as far as they can do so without "involving the connexion in unpleasant party disputes" and injuring our own missionary funds. There is little doubt but the funds of our own society can be increased to a sufficient sum to meet the wants of all the Indian Tribes within the present boundaries of our conference.

You will find an interesting account of the northern and western Indian Tribes referred to by the board, in the "two journals of the Rev. John West, A. M., late chaplain to The Hon. The Hudson's Bay Company." The most of these tribes speak the *Chippewa* tongue; and it is believed, were Evangelical Missionaries sent among them, they would readily embrace Christianity. Two of our native Indian Missionaries have visited some of these tribes and were instrumental in the conversion of several of them. Our own society has had it in contemplation to commence missionary operations among them, but the prosecution of this work has been hitherto delayed for want of adequate means and an effectual door opening almost simultaneously to the several Indian Tribes in our own neighborhood which has thus far employed all the funds we could command for missionary purposes.

It may, at the same time, be remarked, that did our society possess the necessary funds, they could establish missions among even these tribes at a far less expense and to far greater advantage than a society several thousand miles distant. Our society is located upon the ground, is well acquainted with the agricultural and all the local circumstances of the country, the situation, prejudices, and customs of the Indians, the most efficient and economical plans of introducing the gospel among them together with the arts and habits of civilization, and there are laborers in the employ of our society whose past unexampled success

proves them to be well qualified for the work. This however, is only suggested for the consideration of your committee.

It may be proper here to observe, that the progress of Wesleyan Methodism in Upper Canada has been far more rapid than in any other province of British North America, and that without being any burden upon our brethren in Great Britain or elsewhere. A spirit of intellectual improvement and increasing weight of talent, a fervency of spirit and evangelical simplicity are evidently keeping pace in our connexion with our increasing numbers and the improving state of society. Under the blessing of God our Societies are universally living in peace and most of them are in a state of encouraging prosperity, and our missions are every where prosperous,—under these circumstances, when your committee become acquainted with the state of our affairs we are persuaded they will see the unadvisedness of persisting in a measure, which, in its ultimate results, we cannot but view with fearful and melancholy apprehensions.

In pursuance of the instructions of your committee, the Rev. Mr. Turner has recently visited this place and preached for us once. Mr. T's amiable deportment during his residence at Kingston has gained him a high place in the esteem and affections of our preachers generally and has promoted a dearable feeling of brotherly love towards your connexion. His communications to individual members of the Board on the present occasion, have not however been as definite and satisfactory as could have been wished.

We have understood that a station on the Grand River among the Delaware and Cayuga tribes, has been represented to Mr. Turner as unoccupied and as a suitable place for the establishment of your contemplated mission.—It may probably have been unknown to the individual or individuals who may have given Mr. Turner this information, that these tribes are in the vicinity of one of our oldest mission stations; that our Missionaries have preached to them regularly for a length of time; that within the last four months upwards of forty of them have been converted and have joined our society, including several of the principal Chiefs,

Upon the whole it may be submitted to your committee, whether under existing circumstances, your Missionary funds could not be more advantageously applied to the furtherance of the work of human salvation than in the establishment of a mission in this Province—other circumstances aside—at an expense far greater than would be necessary for the Methodist Missionary society here, to impart the same doctrines, the same feelings, the same blessings and effect the same improvements.

You are perhaps not apprised that there are many persons in this Province who would rejoice to witness party disputes among the Methodists and would recommend any measure and do all in their power to create and foment them—rightly judging that if they can but divide, they may eventually destroy them.—But we feel assured that your committee will not knowingly enter upon or sanction any measure that will “involve the connexion in those party disputes,” which are alike destructive to the respectability, purity, and influence of Wesleyan Methodism and the interests of true religion.

We trust your society and ours have a common object in view and that the prayerful and persevering labours of both will be directed in those channels of usefulness and christian philanthropy, which will tend to cement both connexions in strongest bond of christian affection, bring most glory to God, and most happiness to mankind.

We are,  
By order and on behalf of the Missionary Board,  
Yours affectionate in the Gospel of Jesus Christ,

JOHN RYERSON,  
President.

THOS. VAUX,  
Secretary.

YORK, E. C. Oct. 4th, 1831.

D

London, 77 Halton Garden,  
March 13th, 1832.

DEAR BRETHREN,

We embrace the opportunity of forwarding to you by the Rev. Robert Alder, the resolutions adopted by our committee after deliberation on your resolutions, transmitted to us under date York, October 4th, 1831.

We are dear Brethren,  
In the bonds of the Gospel,  
Yours,

JAMES TOWNLEY,  
JOHN JAMES,  
JOHN BEECHAM.

Secretaries to the Wesleyan  
Missionary Society.

To the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal church in Upper Canada.

St. James' Chapel, Montreal, June 5, 1832.

MY DEAR SIR,

As I shall not be able to visit York until after the close of our District meeting, and shall be able to remain there but a very short time, I think it right to forward to you per post, the inclosed resolutions, in order that you may have time to present them to the Board before I wait previously upon you.

I remain Yours truly,

R. ALDER,  
Representative of the Wesleyan  
Missionary Society, and chairman  
of the Canadian District meeting.

TO REV. JOHN RYERSON,  
President of Board of Managers, &c. &c. &c.

#### Resolutions of a committee, held February 1832.

Certain Resolutions of the Board of Missions connected with the Upper Canada Conference objecting to the committee's employing missionaries in Upper Canada and among the Indians having been read at the last meeting of the committee, and the Treasurers and Secretaries having been requested to confer with Messrs. Ryerson and Jones upon this subject they report as follows:—

1. That with respect to the “understanding” alleged in the said resolution to exist between the British and Canadian conferences, that the Missionaries of the former were to confine their labors to Lower Canada, and leave the Upper Province to the exclusive occupation of the Canadian conference, they informed Messrs. Ryerson and Jones that no such understanding could exist, inasmuch as the former compact between the United States general conference ceased upon an independent conference being established for Upper Canada, and that when it was proposed by Mr. Capers to the British conference of 1828 to make a similar agreement with the Canada conference, it was declined.

2. That ever since that time the committee have felt themselves fully at liberty to occupy any station in Upper Canada, to which they might have such a call, as would warrant them to embrace it, with just regard to those general principles of respect to the useful application of funds, and the relation of any body of British Emigrants, members of our societies, and attached to our discipline, to embrace it.

3. That the great change of circumstances as to Upper Canada since the agreement with the states general conference, especially in respect of the immense number of settlers which have gone out from Great Britain and Ireland, and are still flowing into that Province in large numbers every year, was a decisive objection to the committee's recommending it to the conference to confine its missions wholly to Lower Canada, or not to reinforce the mission they have had for some years in Kingston, or not to establish under such circumstances new missions in that Province.

4. That with respect to the principle urged upon the committee in the resolutions of the Canada Board of Missions, “that the Methodists are one in every part of the world,” could only be applicable in the sense of mainte-



nance of fraternal affection, since a unity arising from the existence of but one form of Methodism in one Province, is now out of the question; several distinct bodies of Methodists now existing in Upper Canada, who refuse to place themselves under the pastoral charge of the Canada Conference; and affording sufficient proof, that were our missionaries to be withheld entirely from that Province, a considerable number of independent bodies of Methodists would grow up.

5. That with respect to the Indian missions the original agreement with the United States General Conference did not in any respect relate to them, so as to exclude the committee's endeavours to attempt their evangelization. — They were in fact never referred to in that agreement, but it had long been the committee's intention to aid in this important work, in pursuance of a principle held sacred by the committee to endeavour to connect with missions near European settlers, attempts to benefit the aboriginal heathens of these countries where they may locate themselves. This the committee attempted in Labrador, in connection with the Newfoundland mission in New Holland; and by the blessing of God very successfully in connection with the South African Colonies. The extent of the committee's exertions, and the demands upon their funds were the only reasons which caused them to delay their endeavours to evangelize the Indians in America.

6. That notwithstanding these views of the committee Messrs. Ryerson and Jones were informed that the committee intend nothing as to Upper Canada contrary to that brotherly kindness, which ought to exist between two kindred religious bodies; but that they shall not consider that principle at all contravened, should they fix missionaries in places of considerable population, altho' the Canada Conference may have societies in such places the population being such as to afford reasonable ground to conclude that there is a sufficient sphere of labour for each, much less that it would be any infringement of the said principle should a mission be planted among settlers not yet provided with any religious ordinances.

7. That in the agreement between the United States General Conference and the British Conference, it was explicitly stated, that should Methodism deteriorate in its form and spirit, or should any just political offence be given by the missionaries to the British Government, the British Conference should be at liberty again to employ its missionaries in Upper Canada. The deputation heard no explicit complaint in this respect against the United States Conference, nor did they charge the Canada Conference with either of such matters. This they were not called to enter into, inasmuch as no agreement to partition the two Canadas existed between the committee and the Canada Conference, and they were not therefore under any necessity of scrutinizing the fact; but that they must say with affection, but regret, that the publication of a paper expressly by the Canadian Conference entering warmly and in the spirit of partisanship into the local politics of the Province, was not in the spirit or according to the practice of British Methodism, and contrary to that abstinence from such disputes which they enjoined upon their missionaries; a circumstance which had created prejudice against the acceptableness of the Canada brethren, with a part of the population of Canada. On these points a conversation of some length was held, at the close of which Messrs. Ryerson and Jones were assured of the kind regards of the committee, but were thus frankly put in possession of its views on the subject brought before it in the Resolutions of the Canada Board of mission before mentioned.

# E

## Extract of the proceedings of the Board.

Certain resolutions of the committee of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society in London, passed in February, 1832, and transmitted by the Rev. Robert Alder, the committee's representation having been laid before the board on the evening of the 22d inst., and the Rev. Robert Alder, the Rev. John Hicks, the Rev. Thomas Turner and the Rev. John P. Hetherington being present by previous

invitation; the resolutions of the committee in London enclosed by the Rev. Dr. Townley, and his accompanying letter to the Rev. Wm. Case, dated June 18, 1831, the answer of the board to the same and the resolutions of the Wesleyan committee above referred to were read; after which a long, free, and friendly conversation took place between the members of the board and the missionary brethren, particularly Messrs. Alder and Hicks on the subjects of the several documents named above; at the conclusion of which the board adjourned. At the ensuing adjourned meeting of the board, held the evening of the 29th inst., the following resolutions were adopted.

1. That with respect to the first resolution of the Wesleyan committee, concerning the "understanding," &c., the resolution of the board was founded on their understanding of the report made by the Rev. Mr. Capors, delegate from the American to the British conference in 1828, which concludes thus:—"I did, however, distinctly understand the committee as being of opinion that their missionaries ought not to go into Upper Canada, unless either after some definite arrangement should have been concluded to that effect with the church there; or in case of its notorious inability to supply the people, or its departure from the doctrines, discipline, or economy which distinguish Methodism."

2. That as a large portion of the Canada conference consists of Europeans, as the members of the Methodist societies from Great Britain who have generally united with us, have uniformly expressed themselves satisfied with the economy of Methodism in Canada, and equally edified by our means of grace as in their native country, the influx of European emigration into this Province does not appear to the board to render the organization of Methodist societies distinct from those already established, expedient or advisable—and more especially as the board considers the economy of Methodism in Canada to be as truly Wesleyan as that in Great Britain.

3rd. That the board conceives the principle, "That the Methodists are one people in every part of the world," was understood by Mr. Wesley in a more extensive sense than merely "fraternal affection," as he cherished and taught "fraternal affection" between the Methodists, pious Baptists, Presbyterians, Moravians, &c. who were never represented by him as one with the Methodists in the sense that he declared "the Methodists are one people in all the world, and it is their full determination so to continue."

4. That with the exception of the societies under the care of the Wesleyan committee, the parties (few and small in number and influence) in this Province who call themselves Methodists, and who are not under the superintendence of the Canada conference, differ as widely in their government, economy, and usages, from the English as from the Canada connexion, nor is there any probability that the pastoral charge of the one would be more acceptable to them than that of the other. There is perhaps a greater variety of Methodists (so called) in Great Britain than in Canada.—Hence the introduction of missionaries distinct from those who are already labouring in connexion with the Canada conference, is not likely to produce any greater uniformity in Methodism than now exists, and may lead to serious misunderstandings and party disputes.

5. That with respect to the seventh resolution of the committee, the board beg to refer the committee to Mr. Alder, with whom considerable conversation was held on the subject. It is extremely difficult, if not altogether impracticable, for any person or body of men, however wise and experienced, who are not acquainted with all the local circumstances of the country, to decide with certainty what part should in all cases be taken in matters in which the interests of religion are immediately concerned, but which may more remotely involve questions of political consideration by a ministry or body of people who are not exotic, not missionary, or transient in their residence in the country, but who have grown up therein, and who have a common interest with its permanently settled inhabitants. Whatever may have been said or done respecting what the committee term "political disputes" the board is satisfied that the spirit and practice of Methodism have been preserved and maintained unimpaired, and believes it prevails with an efficiency and to an extent in the country,

in proportion to the population, not exceeded in the United States or Great Britain.

6. That the board most cordially reciprocates the expressions of brotherly kindness and good will conveyed in the resolutions of the committee; and they will do what they can to aid Mr. Turner with native laborers in his contemplated missions to the St. Clair Indians, and will readily co-operate with the committee in cultivating the missionary field among the Indian tribes, as far as is consistent with the interests of their own missions.

7. That the establishment of two distinct connexions of Methodists in this Province, would, in the opinion of the board, be productive of unpleasant feelings, litigation, and party disputes, to the discredit of Methodism and the great injury of religion; but that the energies of the English and Canada connexions, if combined, would under the blessing of God, close the door against all collision and party feeling, and contribute greatly to the extension of the work, both amongst the white population and the Indian tribes.

8. That in order to prevent misunderstandings—to preserve peace and harmony in the societies—to supply every part of the work throughout the Province—and to enlarge the field of missionary operations among the aboriginal inhabitants, the board respectfully suggests to our conference at its approaching session, the propriety and importance of proposing such a coalition with the English conference as will accomplish these objects.

9. That anticipating the adoption of such a measure by our conference as that recommended in the foregoing resolution; and appreciating the pure motives, friendly feelings, and sound judgment of the Rev. Robert Alder, representative of the Wesleyan Missionary society and believing that an interview between him and the conference will be gratifying and satisfactory on both sides, and highly instrumental by the divine blessing in promoting the cause of God and of Methodism, the board respectfully and earnestly invites Mr. Alder to attend the ensuing session of the conference, which will commence in Hallowell the 8th of August next.—The board, under the influence of the same feelings, makes a similar request to the Rev. John Hick, provided he can comply with it, without too great a sacrifice of pastoral duty.

Truly extracted.

# F

REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,

We have the honor to transmit to your committee the enclosed resolutions of our board of missions in answer to those of your committee of February 1832, transmitted by the Rev. Mr. Alder, whose interesting talents, christian candour, and amiable manners, have won much upon the kindly feelings and good wishes of all among us who have enjoyed the pleasure of his society.

You will perceive that the board cannot view some points in the same light with your committee, but that nevertheless, they are most anxious to recommend and concur in any measures that may promote the harmony of Methodism and the interests of religion; and with the view they have solicited Mr. Alder to remain in the Province until our ensuing annual conference.—On the subject of the seventh resolution on the board have, properly speaking, no authority to act or decide; and it was for the purpose of putting your committee into early possession of their views of this subject, which has been long and largely talked of amongst our preachers and people, that they embrace this opportunity of expressing them, hoping at the same time that it might prepare the way for the accomplishment of the highly interesting and important objects proposed.—It is believed there will be very little diversity of opinion in our conference in regard to a measure of this kind.—And if arrangements can be agreed upon by which a connexion be established between the British and Canada conferences analogous to that which exists between the English and Irish conferences, we doubt not but it will be extensively instrumental in advancing the work of God in the Provinces, none of the circumstantial peculiarities of Methodism in Great Britain and Canada (which we think are fewer and smaller than have been supposed, could form any serious

objection on our part, since we maintain that Methodism in all its essential principles and regulations is the same in every part of the world.

We beg to present to you and your committee our own best wishes for your personal welfare, and your success in the responsible and extensive work placed under your control; and we fervently pray God to give your conference and ours a right judgment in all things, and overrule every deliberation and decision for the promotion of His glory and the best interests of mankind.

We are Brethren,  
Yours

In the bonds of the Gospel,  
JOHN HYERSON, President,  
THOMAS VAUX, Secretary.

To Messrs. James Townley,  
John James, John Beecham,  
Sec'ys, London, W. M. C. }

## Treasurer's Account.

Canada Conference Missionary Society in account  
with James R. Armstrong, Treasurer. Cr.

		£	s.	d.
1833	MONEYS PAID TO MR. ARMSTRONG.			
October.	By cash from the Toronto Auxiliary.	14	16	6
Nov. 20.	By collection made by R. Coat.	1	11	3
" 28.	By cash from Matilda Auxiliary through George Brouse, Esq.	6	17	3
1834				
Feb'y.	By donation from R. Burr, Esq.	5	0	0
April 5.	By the Widow's mite.	0	5	0
May 12.	By cash from the Indian children at the Credit.	0	13	7
	By cash from the Dalhousie Missionary Auxiliary.	8	15	0
	By cash from Mr. Keagy (annual.)	1	5	0
	By cash from the Niagara Auxiliary.	10	17	3 1/2
	By cash from the Toronto circuit collected by Messrs. Adams and Fawcett.	2	14	0
	By cash from the Toronto circuit collected by Messrs. Foster & Brown.	1	19	1 1/2
	By cash from the Toronto circuit collected by William Kent.	4	10	0
	By cash from the Trafalgar circuit.	1	5	0
		£	60	9 0
	MONEYS PAID TO MR. CASE.			
Feb. 12.	By cash from the Treasurer of the Hamilton Auxiliary.	30	2	0
	By collections at the Credit Mis'n.	5	12	7
April.	By cash from the Stoney Creek Auxiliary.	2	0	0
	By cash from the Saltfleet Missionary Auxiliary.	3	12	6
	By cash Saltfleet donations.	0	13	1 1/2
	By collection at St. Catharines.	3	16	3 1/2
	By do. at Niagara.	3	18	2
	By do. at McAfee's.	1	0	0
	By donation from G. Ham, Esq.	10	0	0
		£	51	5 6
	MONEYS PAID TO MR. STINSON.			
Feb'y.	By cash from the Brockville Auxiliary.	4	2	0
	By cash from the Belleville Auxiliary to Mr. Johnson.	6	5	0
	By cash from the Hamilton Aux'y.	3	17	6
	By the Rice Lake subscription.	5	16	3
	By the Muncy Town do.	1	17	4
	By cash from the Hamilton Aux'y.	3	10	0

Methodiam  
the same in

our own best  
ness in the  
our control;  
ference and  
every de-  
glory and

nel,  
President,  
Secretary.

account  
Cr.

C s. d.

14 16 6

1 11 3

6 17 3

5 0 0

0 5 0

0 13 7

8 15 0

1 5 0

10 17 34

2 14 0

1 19 14

4 10 0

1 5 0

50 9 0

50 2 0

5 12 7

2 0 0

3 12 6

0 13 14

3 16 34

3 18 2

1 0 0

1 5 6

4 2 0

6 5 0

3 17 6

5 16 3

1 17 4

3 10 0

1894  
June,

By the Grape Island subscription,	1 7 0
By Mr. Irwin's subscription,.....	2 10 0
By cash from the Niagara Aux'y.,	26 4 34
By cash from Mr. Metcalf from the	
50 Mile Creek Auxiliary,.....	1 9 7
By cash from Elizabeth,.....	2 10 0
By cash from Smithville Auxiliary,	1 16 0
By Brown's Bridge subscription,...	0 17 6
By cash from Woodhouse Aux'y.,	2 7 0
By cash from Simcoe do.,	2 7 6
By cash from Mt Pleasant do.,	1 15 0
By cash from the Aux bury in Keel-	
er's neighbourhood,.....	5 5 0
By Mr. Gibson's subscription by	
Mr. Green,.....	2 10 0
By Daniel Barry's subscription,...	1 0 0
By Alex. Campbell's subscription,	2 10 0
By subscription from Merrickville,	0 12 6
By cash from Brown's neighbour-	
hood,.....	0 5 0
By cash from the Prescut Aux'y.,	1 1 3
By cash from Elizabethtown do.,	4 15 0
By cash from the Parent Society in	
London drawn at different times	
during the year,.....	1893 1 0
	£2091 6 84

Dr.

CREDIT MISSION.

To the Rev. Wm. Case's salary,...	87 10 0
To the Rev. Peter Jones do.,	75 0 0
To the School Teacher do.,	35 0 0
To the Rev. Wm. Case's travel-	
ling expenses,.....	4 11 6
To the Rev. Wm. Case's horse do.	9 15 1
To the removal of Mr. Case's fa-	
mily from Grape Island to the	
River Credit,.....	5 18 3
To stationary for the Credit school,	2 11 74
To Mr. Case's postage,.....	3 18 44
To repairing Mission and School-	
houses,.....	41 4 2
To the Rev. Peter Jones travelling	
expenses,.....	2 9 0
	£267 18 0

LAKE SIMCOE MISSION.

To Mr. Belton's salary,.....	75 0 0
To Miss Manwaring's do. school	
teacher,.....	35 0 0
To John Simson's do. interpreter,	43 0 0
To John Snake's do. do.,	18 0 0
To removing Mr. Belton's family	
to mission,.....	10 17 14
To Miss Manwaring's travelling ex-	
penses,.....	1 10 0
To Mr. Belton's horse keeping,...	3 5 0
To Mr. Belton's travelling expen-	
ses at mission,.....	1 7 10
To stationary for the school,.....	0 10 5
To stove for the mission house,...	1 9 44
	£189 19 94

RICE LAKE MISSION.

To Mr. McMullin's salary,.....	75 0 0
To do. horse keeping,.....	5 0 0
To do. travelling expenses,	3 9 64
To Miss Penny for teaching school	
9 months,.....	26 5 0
To articles for school and board of	
boys in the family,.....	7 4 04
To finishing the chapel and mis-	
sion house,.....	149 8 5
	£286 7 0

MURPHY TOWN MISSION.

To Mr. Adams salary,.....	100 0 0
To do. travelling expenses,.....	2 8 0
To Mr. Hurlburt's salary, school	
teacher,.....	43 0 0
To George Henry's, interpreter,...	37 10 0
To Miss Adams' for one quarter's	
teaching,.....	10 0 0
To timber for a new school house,	8 6 9
To Mr. Adams, travelling expen-	
ses to Conference,.....	1 10 0
To lock for the school,.....	0 1 104
To books for the school,.....	0 10 34
	£203 6 11

GRAND RIVER MISSION.

To Mr. Messmore's salary,.....	75 0 0
To removing do's family to mis'n,	8 0 0
To do's horse-keeping, &c.,.....	6 15 0
To Moses Walker's salary,.....	37 10 0
To Joseph Doxtater's do.,.....	37 10 0
To John do's do.,.....	12 10 0
To Mr. McEwen's do. teacher,	43 0 0
To materials for building a school	
house,.....	10 0 0
To stationary for mission school,...	0 15 0
	£231 0 0

SAINT CLAIR MISSION.

To Mr. Turner's salary for 2 years,	102 0 0
To family expenses, including the	
removal of Mr. T's family to	
and from the mission,.....	70 10 0
To furniture for the mission house,	10 16 10
To horse, saddle and bridle for	
the mission,.....	18 10 0
To timber and building stable,	
horse-keeping, &c.,.....	14 3 2
To Charles Rood and Geo. Hen-	
ry, interpreters,.....	1 10 6
	£217 10 6

GRAPE ISLAND MISSION.

To Mr. Hurlburt's salary,.....	62 10 0
To John Sunday's do.,.....	50 0 0
To Miss Hurlburt's do.,.....	35 0 0
	£147 10 0

MOHAWK MISSION.

To Mr. Johnson's salary,.....	62 10 0
To Mr. Davidson for visiting the	
mission,.....	10 0 0
To land for the use of the mission,	2 10 0
To materials for building a mission	
house,.....	19 10 0
To wine for the Sacrament,.....	0 1 8
	£94 11 8

SANGHEENG MISSION.

To Brother Hurlburt for services	
during part of the year,.....	10 0 0
To Brother Sawyer for do.,.....	17 10 0
To Mr. Hurlburt's travelling ex-	
penses,.....	3 0 0
To Mr. Sawyer's do. do.,.....	2 17 6
To outfit for Sangheeng, including	
cart, oxen, nets, &c.,.....	42 0 8
	£75 8 2

MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS

To Sydney mission,.....	30 0 0
To Cavan do.,.....	10 0 0
To the Clarendon do.,.....	7 10 0
To the Brock do.,.....	5 0 0
To the support of an Indian boy	
at Cazenovia,.....	15 10 0
To debts on the Canadian missions	
at the Conference of October,	
I	

1833, by order of the President, paid, .....	205	14	0	
To Mr. Framer for missionary services, .....	24	10	2	
To postage on letters on public business, .....	5	1	0	
	£	307	14	8
Total amount of expenditures, £	2091	0	8	

**NOTE.**—The cash account is made up to the Conference only. All sums received and paid since that time will be placed in the next report.

Nine pounds five shillings have been returned from the Grand River, and four pounds thirteen shillings and five pence from the Mohawk Mission, which will be inserted in the next report.

### Treasurer's Account.

*Canada Conference Missionary Society, in Account  
with James R. Armstrong, Treasurer, from June  
1894, up to June 1895.*

I. NIAGARA DISTRICT.		Cn.	
<i>Hamilton Circuit.</i>			
Collected by Mrs. E. Evans and Mrs. E. JACKSON.			
Edward Jackson	£1 10 0	Mary Gilligan	2 6
Lydia A. Jackson	1 5 0	Mrs. Clement	2 6
Doctor J. Lister	1 5 0	Aaron Clout	1 0 0
Thomaslin Lister	10 0	James Cahill	2 6
Jacob Bastedo	10 0	R. G. Bosley	2 6
Cash	2 6	Cash	2 6
Cash	2 6	Sarah Green	0 34
C. J. Ives	10 0	Abert G. S. Saria	5 0
Isaac Ryan	1 3	Minerva Merrick	2 6
Cornelia Spafford	10 0	Wm. F. Clarke	2 6
Hugh Moore	2 6	Manig Backmer	2 6
Samuel Sloan	5 0	Mercy Clark	2 6
William A. Davis	1 1	Sarah Winer	2 6
Catherine Dewey	2 6	Miss Bell	1 104
William Fish	5 0	Miss Hardiker	0 74
Daniel Dewey	2 6	Fidelity Ives	2 6
Benjamin Johnson	2 6	Elzaur Alford	5 0
Cash	5 0	Mary Webb	1 3
John Stinson	5 0	William Williams	1 3
Cash	4 3	Andrew W. Gray	2 1
Cash	1 3	Eli Tynes	5 0
Murray Anderson	10 0	W. D. Spafford	1 6
Dennis Moore	5 0	E. Stinson	5 0
Cash	2 10	A. Brit. Wesleyan	5 0
Cash	1 3	Geo. C. Briggs	2 6
Colby Kimble	10 0	Collected by Miss Shaw, and Miss Price.	
Eather Kimble	2 6	Wm. M'Donald	1 5 0
Mrs. Noxon	1 3	M'aly M'Donald	1 5 0
Edward Teague	5 0	W. A. M'Donald	5 0
Rev. E. Evans	1 0 0	Ezra Wilcox	5 0
Thomas Brown	5 0	G. Stronbridge	10 0
Mrs. Brown	2 6	S. Muel Kerr	5 0
Miss Lowell	2 6	St. Downes	10 0
Edward Magill	5 0	Young, Weir, & Co	1 5 0
Robert Lewis	2 6	J. N. Akman	10 0
Henrietta Bosley	2 6	Parker & Co.	5 0
N'cy. Stronbridge	5 0	A. Bigelow	10 0
Mrs. P. Kildan	2 6	James S. Finney	2 6
S. Woods	10 0	Rosael Prentiss	10 0
Manahil Woods	10 0	Betsey Prentiss	5 0
		Mac Crisern	1 8
		Paola Brown	2 6
		George Hyatt	5 0
		J. R. Polard	2 6
		Michael Akman	2 6
		James M'Intyre	2 6
		Charles Durand	2 6

John Mills, . . .	2	6	Daniel Lundy, . . .	2	6
Christina Mills, . .	5	9	B. James Corwin, 1	7	6
Ann, M.lla, . . .	5	0	Paulino Corwin, . .	2	6
C. Chaffield, . . .	5	0	James Slaight, . . .	5	0
Catherine Magill, .	2	6	Mary Morris, . . .	5	0
Rory Magill, . . .	3	0	Dr. J. J. LeMay, . .	5	0
Mary Magill, . . .	2	0	D. Williams, (sub), .	10	3
A Friend, . . .	1	0	Sarah Willson, . . .	2	6
Maria Price, . . .	10	0	William Garner, . .	2	6
Mrs. Clements, . .	1	3	Joseph Moore, . . .	2	6
Dr. R. Springer, . .	1	5	Mrs. Moore, . . .	2	6
Dr. S. R. Springer, .	1	5	William Forsyth, . .	5	0
Ch'ly. Dugdo, . . .	2	6	Sophronia Forsyth, .	2	6
A. Stevens, . . .	2	6	Mrs. Merrain, . . .	2	6
Ed't. Henderson, . .	2	6	Joseph M. rrian, . .	2	6
Robert Murray, . .	2	6	Maria Merriam, . .	2	6
Peter Inouen, . . .	0	7	Ann Garner, . . .	2	6
Sandey small sums .	3	7	Rachel R.az, . . .	5	0
Mr. Sewell, . . .	2	6	Catharine Lundy, . .	2	11
M. A. Wright, . . .	1	3	Mrs. Bender, . . .	2	6
G. orge Morgan, . .	1	3	Mary Robbins, . . .	2	6
Wm. Gattermole, . .	5	0	George B. nder, . .	1	5
Dr. Jabez Kollogg, .	1	0	Esther Bunder, . .	1	5
S. M. Hattaway, . .	2	6	Agnes Shannon, . .	2	6
Public Collections at			David Lynch, . . .	2	6
Miss J. Bailey's			P. lip Garner, . . .	2	6
mission Box at			Lydia Corwin, . . .	2	6
do . . . . .	2	5	Jacob Grner, . . .	2	6
Miss Stanley's col-			Algal Garner, . . .	2	6
lection from in-			Sopnia Emmons, . .	2	6
fant school at . .	3	0	Mrs. Morse, . . .	2	6
Rem'ing in Treas-			John Corwin, . . .	2	6
urer's hands, . . .			Catharine Corwin, .	2	6
Feb. 2, 1835, . . .	12	13	William Owens, . .	2	6
			S. Falconbridge, . .	2	6
			A. Spencer, . . .	2	6

Totals.		Donations.	
Remaining in the hands of local Treasurer, . . .	£65 2 10	R. Marsh, . . .	1 8
Received by the General Treasurer, . . .	43 12 6	F. Peacock, . . .	1 3
P. Bowman sub'n, . . .	1 5 0	J. M. Kelly, . . .	1 3
Philp Spauld, do . . .	1 5 0	M. Digger, . . .	1 13
Mrs. P. Spauld, do . . .	1 5 0	M. Douglas, . . .	1 3
L. Hall, do . . .	10 0 0	C. Storey h., . . .	1 3
A Friend, do . . .		E. Slought, . . .	1 3
By Rev E. Evans, . . .	5 0	Mrs. Bulcock, . . .	1 3
Collect. at Bowman's Chapel, . . .	5 0 6	Mary Cann, . . .	1 0
Do. at Glanford, . . .	1 9 1	Maria Hicks, . . .	0 8
Do. at Barton, . . .	2 15 2		
Do. at the Rock Chapel, . . .	1 8 9		
<b>Total</b> . . .	£50 2 2		£13 13 6

Isaac Bowman	£ 2 0	John Vanevery,	2 6
William Offid,	2 6	James McOwan,	2 6
Adam Kilman,	1 5 0	John Kerr,	1 5 0
Adam Spencer,	15 0	Robert McKinlay,	5 0
Ann Spencer,	2 6	David Copland,	2 6
Anna Spencer,	2 6	George Hutt,	2 6
Adam Fralick,	2 6	Geo. Keifer, Esq.,	2 10 0
Sayner Beach,	2 6	Jacob Seburn,	2 6
M. Cook,	2 6	Robert Lord,	2 6
Eliza Clurin,	2 6	James Jones,	2 6
G.orge Wright	2 6	Wm. Vanevery,	2 6
Polly Lundy,	2 6	Joseph Vanevery,	2 6
Matilda Lundy,	2 6	Janet McKinlay,	2 6
George Garner,	2 6	Lavinia Clow,	2 6
Christiana Garner	2 6	Deborah Clow,	2 6
Elizabeth Garner,	2 6	Ann McKinlay,	2 6
		Mary Kerr,	2 6
		Wm. Clement,	2 6
		Susan Mcicking,	2 6
		Susan Hutt,	2 6





# 36 Appendix to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

Rideau, Rev. Mr.		Grape Island do.	9	4	11
Brown, .....	0 5 0	Lake Simcoe do.	18	15	8
Do. Mrs. Shaler, ..	0 5 0	Rice Lake do.	5	8	7
		Grand River do.	7	15	7
	£21 2 8	Sahgeeng do.	2	7	5
		Amherstburg do.	12	14	34
		Muncy, do.	3	7	6
			£72	5	64

## 6. MISSIONARY DISTRICT.

Isle of Tantisub-  
scriptions and  
donations,.... 12 11 7

## Recapitulation.

Cr.

By Total from the Niagara District,	£114	6	11
" " " " London do.....	23	14	5
" " " " Toronto do.....	121	7	8
" " " " Bay of Quinte do	140	8	5
" " " " Augusta do.....	21	2	8
" " " " Missionary do.....	72	5	64
" Cash from the Treasurer of the Parent Society.....	1,798	5	24
" Cash returned from Grand River Mission last year,.....	9	5	0
" Cash returned from Mohawk Mis- sion last year,.....	9	13	5
	£2,310	8	54

Dr.

To the Credit Mission,.....	£229	10	94
Lake Simcoe & Coldwater missions	222	16	114
Rice and Mud Lake Missions.....	174	0	9
Muncy Town mission,.....	159	17	6
Grand River mission,.....	256	1	1
St. Clair mission,.....	148	5	3
Grape Island and Mohawk mission	263	16	10
Isle of Tante mission,.....	56	4	10
Sahgeeng and Goderich mission...	109	8	1
Amherstburgh & Sandwich mission	180	16	74
J. Maffit, for services at the Mohawk mission in 1834,.....	10	0	0
Guardian Office, for printing Re- ports, &c.....	13	3	6
Books and Stationary for mission schools, &c.....	11	2	84
Postage of Letters, &c. on public business,.....	9	12	7
B. Nankeville, for services at the Credit, (extra grant),.....	5	0	0
Sending two Indians to Lake Nip- issing,.....	5	0	0
Sundry articles of Furniture for mission houses,.....	17	4	3
Removing Mr. Johnson's family from the Mohawk mission to Prescott	6	4	0

Supplying destitute settlements, poor  
circuits and other contingent expenses, 347 18 2

Balance in Treasurer's hands £2,226 3 104  
84 4 7

£2,310 8 54

NOTE.—The following sums have been received  
since the Report was made up, and will be credited in  
the Report for next year, viz:

Cramahe Female Missionary Society,  
per T. Beavitt,..... £2 10 0  
Sundry persons in Ernestown, per E.  
Switzer,..... 4 5 0

## I

Canada Conference Auxiliary Missionary Society in  
account with James R. Armstrong, Treasurer. Cr.

	1833	1834		£	s.	d.
October.	By cash from the Toronto Auxili- ary,.....			14	16	6
Nov. 20,	By collection made by R. Coats, ..			1	11	3
" 28,	By cash from Matilda Auxiliary through George Brouse, Esq.			6	17	3
Feb'y,	By donation from R. Burr, Esq...			5	0	0
April 5,	By the Widow's mite,.....			0	5	0
May 12,	By cash from the Indian children at the Credit,.....			0	13	7
	By cash from the Dahlie Mission- ary Auxiliary,.....			8	15	0
	By cash from Mr. Kengy (annual), ..			1	5	0
	By cash from the Niagara Auxilia- ry,.....			10	17	34
	By cash from the Toronto circuit collected by Messrs. Adams and Fawcett,.....			2	14	0
	By cash from the Toronto circuit collected by Messrs. Foster & Brown,.....			1	19	14
	By cash from the Toronto circuit collected by William Kent,...			4	10	0
	By cash from the Trafalgar circuit,			1	5	0
				£	60	9 0
Feb. 12,	MONEYS PAID TO MR. CASE.					
	By cash from the Treasurer of the Hamilton Auxiliary,.....			30	2	0
April,	By collections at the Credit Mis'n,			5	12	7
	By cash from the Stoney Creek Auxiliary,.....			2	0	0
	By cash from the Saltfleet Missi- onary Auxiliary,.....			3	12	6
	By cash Saltfleet donations,.....			0	13	114
	By collection at St. Catharines, ..			3	16	34
	By do. at Niagara,.....			3	18	2
	By do. at McAfee's,.....			1	0	0
	By donation from G. Ham, Esq...			10	0	
				£	51	5 6
October,	MONEYS PAID TO MR. STIMSON.					
	By cash from the Rev. G. Marsden in behalf of the Parent com- mittee, £900 sterling,.....	1834		1000	0	0
Feb'y,	By cash from the Brockville Aux- iliary,.....			4	2	0
	By cash from the Belleville Aux- iliary to Mr. Johnson,.....			6	5	0
	By cash from the Hamilton Aux'y,			3	17	6
	By the Rice Lake subscription,...			5	16	3
	By the Muncy Town do.....			1	17	4
	By cash from the Hamilton Aux'y,			3	10	0

47 18 2

26 3 10 1/2  
84 4 7

10 8 5 1/2

n received  
credited in

22 10 0

4 5 0

Society in  
surer. Cr.

£ s. d.

14 16 6

1 11 3

6 17 3

5 0 0

0 5 0

0 13 7

8 15 0

1 5 0

10 17 3 1/2

2 14 0

1 19 1 1/2

4 10 0

1 5 0

10 9 0

0 2 0

5 12 7

2 0 0

3 12 6

0 13 1 1/2

3 16 3 1/2

3 18 2

1 0 0

10 0

1 5 6

0 0 0

2 0

5 0

17 6

16 3

17 4

10 0

1834  
June,

By the Grape Island subscription,.....	1 7 0
By Mr. Irvine's subscription,.....	2 10 0
By cash from the Niagara Aux'y,.....	26 4 3 1/2
By cash from Mr. Metcalf from the 50 Mile Creek Auxiliary,.....	1 9 7
By cash from Elizabeth,.....	2 10 0
By cash from Smithville Auxiliary,.....	1 16 0
By Brown's Bridge subscription,.....	0 17 6
By cash from Woodhouse Aux'y,.....	2 7 6
By cash from Simcoe do,.....	2 7 6
By cash from M't Pleasant do,.....	1 15 0
By cash from the Aux liary in Kee- ler's neighbourhood,.....	5 7 0
By Mr. Gibson's subscription by Mr. Green,.....	2 10 0
By Daniel Burny's subscription,.....	1 0 0
By Alex. Campbell's subscription,.....	2 10 0
By subscription from Merrickville, By cash from Brown's neighbour- hood,.....	0 12 6
By cash from the Prescott Aux'y, By cash from Elizabethtown do,.....	0 5 0
By bills upon the Treasurer of the Parent Society at different times and appropriated to the current expenses of missions,.....	1 1 3 4 15 0
	£ 593 1 0

## Dr.

1833-4

## CREDIT MISSION.

To the Rev. Wm. Case's salary,...	87 10 0
To the Rev. Peter Jones do,...	75 0 0
To the School Teacher do,...	35 0 0
To the Rev. Wm. Case's travel- ling expenses,.....	4 11 6
To the removal of Mr. Case's fa- mily from Grape Island to the River Credit,.....	9 15 1
To stationary for the Credit school, To Mr. Case's postage,.....	5 18 3
To repairing Mission and School- houses,.....	2 11 7 1/2
To the Rev. Peter Jones travelling expenses,.....	3 18 4 1/2
	41 4 2
	2 9 0
	£ 267 18 0

## LAKE SIMCOE MISSION.

To Rev. S. Belton's salary,.....	75 0 0
To Miss Manwaring's do. school teacher,.....	35 0 0
To John Simson's do. interpreter, To John Snake's do. do,.....	43 0 0
To removing Rev. S. Belton's fa- mily to mission,.....	18 0 0
To Miss Manwaring's travelling ex- penses,.....	10 17 1 1/2
To Rev. S. Belton's horse-keeping, To Rev. S. Belton's travelling ex- penses at mission,.....	1 10 0
To stationary for the school,.....	3 5 0
To stove for the mission house,...	0 10 5
	1 9 4 1/2
	£ 189 19 9 1/2

## RICE LAKE MISSION.

To Rev. D. McMullin's salary,.....	75 0 0
To do. horse keeping,.....	5 0 0
To do. travelling expenses,.....	3 9 6 1/2
To Miss Penny for teaching school 9 months,.....	26 5 0
To articles for school and board of boys in the family,.....	7 4 0 1/2
To finishing the chapel and mis- sion house,.....	149 8 5
	£ 266 7 0

K

## MUNCY TOWN MISSION.

To Rev. E. Adams salary,.....	100 0 0
To do. travelling expenses,.....	2 8 0
To T. Hurlburt's salary, school teacher,.....	43 0 0
To Geo. Henry's, do. interpreter, To Miss Adams' for one quarter's teaching,.....	37 10 0
To timber for a new school house, To Rev. E. Adams, travelling ex- penses to Conference,.....	10 0 0
To lock and books for the school,.....	8 6 9
	1 10 0
	0 12 2
	£ 203 6 11

## GRAND RIVER MISSION.

To Rev. J. Messmore's salary,....	75 0 0
To removing do's family to mis'n, To do's horse-keeping, &c,.....	8 0 0
To Moses Walker's salary,.....	6 15 0
To Joseph Dextater's do,.....	37 10 0
To John do's do,.....	37 10 0
To John McEwen's do. teacher, To materials for building a school house,.....	12 10 0
To stationary for mission school,...	43 0 0
	10 0 0
	0 15 0
	£ 231 0 0

## SAINT CLAIR MISSION.

To Rev. T. Turner's salary for 2 years,.....	102 0 0
To family expenses, including the removal of his family to and from the mission,.....	70 10 0
To furniture for the mission house, To horse, saddle and bridle for the mission,.....	10 16 10
To timber and building stable, horse-keeping, &c,.....	18 10 0
To Charles Rood and Geo. Hen- ry, interpreters,.....	14 3 2
	1 10 6
	£ 217 10 6

## GRAPE ISLAND MISSION.

To S. Hurlburt's salary,.....	62 10 0
To John Sunday's do,.....	50 0 0
To Miss Hurlburt's do,.....	35 0 0
	£ 147 10 0

## MOHAWK MISSION.

To Mr. Johnson's salary,.....	62 10 0
To Rev. J. C. Davidson for visiting the mission,.....	10 0 0
To land for the use of the mission, To materials for building a mission house,.....	2 10 0
To wine for the Sacrament,.....	19 10 0
	0 1 8
	£ 94 11 8

## SANGHENG MISSION.

To T. Hurlburt for services dur- ing part of the year,.....	10 0 0
To Brother Sawyer for do,.....	17 10 0
To Brother Hurlburt's travelling expenses,.....	3 0 0
To Brother Sawyer's do. do,.....	2 17 6
To outfit for Sangheng, including cart, oxen, nets, &c,.....	42 0 8
	£ 75 8 2

## MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS

To Sydney mission,.....	30 0 0
To Cavan do,.....	10 0 0
To the Clarendon do,.....	7 10 0
To the Brock do,.....	5 0 0
To the support of an Indian boy at Cazenovia,.....	15 10 0
To debts on the Canadian missions at the Conference of October,	

1833, by order of the President, paid, .....	295 14 0
To Mr. Fraser for missionary services, .....	28 19 2
To postage on letters on public business, .....	5 1 0
	<hr/>
	£ 397 14 8
Total amount of expenditures, £2001 6 84	

Note.—Under the head of Salary is embraced allowances of every kind, except travelling expenses.

## K

MARTIS, 1<sup>o</sup>. DIE JULII, 1828.

THE REV. ROBERT ALDER, called in and examined.

The Rev. Rob't Alder. You have acted as one of the missionaries of the British Wesleyan Conference in Canada?—I have.

Are you acquainted with the circumstances of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion in Upper and Lower Canada?—I am very well acquainted with their circumstances in Lower Canada, and partially acquainted with their state in Upper Canada.

Can you state what the number of Wesleyan ministers at present in Lower Canada is?—There are nine.

Are those all of them natural born subjects of the King?—They are all natives of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

By whom are they employed and under whose direction do they act?—They are employed by the British Conference, a body that is recognised in a deed enrolled in the High Court of Chancery in England; and they continue to act under the direction of that conference during the whole period of their missionary labor. From the peculiar nature of our discipline, the conduct of every minister abroad is as well known to the conference at home as is the conduct of any of our ministers in England.

In what way are the Wesleyan missionaries in Lower Canada set apart to the work of the ministry?—By the imposition of hands and prayer, after they have been examined three several times respecting their general knowledge and theological attainments, &c.

Are they entirely devoted to their profession as missionaries, or are they engaged also in any secular employment?—They are wholly devoted to the work of the ministry; they are not allowed even to keep a school for their own private emolument, whatever instruction they give to the rising generation is wholly gratuitous.

From what sources do they derive their income?—From the voluntary contributions of the people amongst whom they labor, and the British conference.

What is the average amount of income of each minister, and upon what principle is it regulated?—A married missionary is allowed a furnished dwelling house, and a sum of about 100 guineas per annum; if he have three children he is allowed £35 additional for his children, and so on in proportion to the number of his family.

Then are the committee to understand that the British Conference annually expend a sum to cover the deficiency of the voluntary contributions of the people in Canada?—They do.

Can you state what sum is generally expended by the British Conference for the support of the Mission in Canada?—From £500 to £700 in support of our mission in Lower Canada.

Have each of those ministers a chapel at which they perform service?—Yes; and with the exceptions of the ministers stationed at Quebec and Montreal, whose labors are chiefly confined to those two places, our missionaries in the country preach on the average to five congregations weekly, and frequently travel from 50 to 70 miles.

What is the number of chapels or school houses in Lower Canada, which are used for the purposes of public worship in your connexion?—I think we have 10 chapels in Lower Canada and probably between 40 and 50 other places in which we usually perform Divine service.

Can you state the number of the members in your Societies, and the number of those who generally attend your congregations?—We have about 1,500 members in our societies in Lower Canada, and our congregations probably amount to between 5,000 and 6,000.

Do you find that considerable numbers, exclusive of those 5,000 or 6,000 attend occasionally, tho' belonging to other denominations?—They do occasionally.

In what manner are the chapels and places of public worship erected?—By the voluntary contributions of the people, who sometimes involve themselves in pecuniary difficulties in erecting places of worship—our chapel at Montreal cost between £4,000 and £5,000 and the expense was defrayed entirely by the people there.

Do you conceive there is an abundant supply of religious instruction for the demands of the people?—No, I do not conceive there is a sufficient supply; there is not a sufficient supply of Wesleyan Missionaries in Lower Canada.

What do you conceive to be the reason of that?—The want of pecuniary means. The monies raised by the Methodist connexion in England for missionary purposes are appropriated for the support of missionaries in Ireland, in Western and Southern Africa, and in the East and West Indies, as well as in North America. The reason why we wish to obtain a portion of the Clergy Reserves is not for our private emolument; but that we may be enabled to extend our missionary operations in Lower Canada.

Have not the Wesleyan Ministers been particularly active in the eastern townships of Lower Canada?—Yes, and with the exception of the clergymen of the Church of England there are no other ministers connected with any ecclesiastical body in England, that preach in those Townships.

Do you conceive that if the Wesleyan Ministers were withdrawn from the Townships, the Church of England would be capable of supplying them with clergy?—No, I think not;—and this is the opinion of the Governor-General, from whose letter to me, which I received a few days before I left the Province, I beg permission to read an extract:—"We all know, (his Lordship observes) that the Established Church cannot provide clergymen at all places where they are required and desired; in that difficulty the Wesleyan Ministers have rendered most valuable services, and I think they are qualified and capable to render much greater services under the protection and encouragement which they desire from his Majesty's Government."

Are there no Presbyterian Ministers of the Kirk of Scotland in the Eastern Townships of Lower Canada?—Not one.

What other religious communities are there besides the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodists having ministers in the country parts of Canada who act under the direction of ecclesiastical authorities in Great Britain?—None; there is not a minister in any of those townships, with the exception of the clergy of the Church of England, and our own ministers, who act under the direction of any ecclesiastical authority in Great Britain.

You have stated the number of Methodist ministers in Lower Canada and the number of their congregations;—will you give the committee the same information with regard to Upper Canada so far as you are acquainted with it?—In Upper Canada there are 46 Methodist ministers; there are 66 chapels, and about 530 other places in which divine service is regularly performed.

What do you consider to be the number of your members, and the number of your regular hearers, in Upper Canada?—The number of members of the Methodist society in U. Canada is 9,000, the number of regular hearers is 37,000, making one-fifth of the whole population of the Province.

In addition to those you have mentioned is there not also a Methodist mission among the Mississauga Indians?—There is, and according to the testimony of the Venerable Archdeacon of Quebec, the labors of the Wesleyan Ministers

amongst those Indians have been of great advantage to them in a social as well as in a religious and moral point of view.

Are the methodist congregations in U. Canada under the direction of the missionaries sent out by the British conference?—They are not; hitherto they have been under the direction of the methodist conference of the United States; that connexion, however, is now dissolved, and we expect that an arrangement will soon be made, by which the methodists of Upper Canada will be brought to act under the direction of the British conference as the methodists of Lower Canada have done for several years.

Is there any point of difference either in doctrine or discipline between the British and American conference?—Not any of importance. We consider ourselves to be one body; but we do not deem it right that the methodists of Upper Canada should be under the jurisdiction of a foreign ecclesiastical authority.

Then are the committee to understand that there would be no objection on the part of those congregations, provided you had the means of furnishing ministers to receive those ministers sent by the British conference fully as readily as those sent by the conference of New-York?—The conference of the United States does not now send any ministers to Upper Canada. The people are very anxious to be supplied with ministers from this country; and we have the most pressing petitions sent to us annually for English ministers.

By whom has the supply of Wesleyan ministers from the United States been prohibited?—By an agreement between the methodists of Upper Canada and the methodist conference of the United States.

Then you consider that it is the desire of the methodists in Upper Canada rather to have ministers furnished by the British conference than by the conference of the United States?—Yes, I have reason to believe that is the case.

And that it is from the wish of the people themselves that the methodist ministers of the United States are now prevented from coming into Upper Canada?—Yes; from the influence of British feeling.

Do you conceive that the Colonial Government in Upper Canada has manifested any desire for the extension of the British Wesleyan methodists in that Province?—I believe there are documents in the Colonial-Office addressed to Earl Bathurst and to Mr. Huskisson from Sir Peregrine Maitland which will show that his Excellency is very anxious that the number of British methodist ministers should be increased as far as possible in Upper Canada; and I understand that he wrote home a short time ago recommending that pecuniary aid might be allowed us for that purpose.

Do you consider that under the 31st of the late King the Wesleyan Methodists have any claim according to the letter of the statute, to any share of the Clergy reserves, or are they only desirous of obtaining a portion of them, in case the statute should be altered in that point?—There is a difference of opinion among us on this subject, but the general opinion of our ministers in Lower Canada I believe is this, that if the revenues be appropriated to the sole use of the Church of England, we shall offer no objection to it, but that if the Presbyterians are to have any part of those reserves then we conceive that we have at least an equally good claim with them; and we should be very much dissatisfied if our claims were disallowed.

Do you mean then to found your claim to a share in the Clergy reserves only upon a principle of equity as being one of the most numerous bodies of Protestants in that country, and not upon the principle of the precise construction of the law?—As I have already stated there is a difference of opinion upon that subject, some of our friends think we have a legal claim, and others think that no other denomination has any claim in law but the Church of England, however the general opinion amongst us on the subject is what I before stated to the committee.

Suppose there were an alteration to take place in this respect by which you were enabled to make good your claim to any portion of the reserves, upon what principle would you exclude other denominations of Protestant dissenters?—We do not wish to exclude them, but we conceive that we are placed in totally different circumstances from Dissent-

ers in Lower Canada, because the British Conference of the Wesleyan connexion is accountable to Government and the public of Great Britain, for the good behavior of all their missionaries, whereas the ministers of the dissenting churches can only give their own personal security for their good behaviour; we conceive that on that ground our claim is much better than theirs. The Wesleyan Conference also as I have stated, expends a considerable sum annually in support of our mission in Canada. We rest our claim also on the good that has been effected in the Canadas through the instrumentality of the Methodists, and their present numbers, and respectability.

Has there been any dissatisfaction felt among the Wesleyan Methodists in Lower Canada at their not being allowed to keep a Register of their births, marriages and burials?—Very great dissatisfaction, for although we are of opinion that a refusal so completely opposed to every thing like toleration does not at all lessen us in the estimation of the people of Lower Canada, we feel it to be a degradation to the community to which we belong, besides either the children of our members must grow up without receiving from us christian baptism, and the bodies of our deceased friends remain without the right of christian burial, or we must expose ourselves to a very severe penalty in performing those duties.

Is there any provincial statute which according to your interpretation of it, would give you the right of registry?—There is.

Has there been a difference of opinion among the Judges as to the explanation of that statute?—There has, Judge Sewell, the Chief Justice of the Province of Lower Canada, has put such a construction upon the law as has been the means of depriving us of a legal register; he has decided that the Methodists and dissenters are not Protestants, and that as the act merely provides for the celebration of those services by Protestant Ministers, we are not entitled to perform them! Judge Reid and his associates of the Court of King's Bench in the district of Montreal, are of a different opinion; as a proof of which, Judge Reid for some years granted our missionary in Montreal a legal register.

Was there not a bill passed in the provincial legislature for the purpose of remedying this inconvenience?—There was.

Are you aware of the grounds on which the Royal assent was refused to that bill?—I believe it was not on account of any objection to the principle of the bill, but on account of some informality connected with it.

Would it be satisfactory to the Wesleyans in general if a short act were passed, being a declaratory act of the intentions of the disputed statute of the 35th of George the 3rd?—It would.

Upon what footing does this matter stand in England?—We are allowed to administer the sacrament of baptism, and to bury the dead in England; and we keep regular registers of our baptisms and burials.

Have you similar rights in the other North American Colonies?—In all the North American Colonies we are allowed to administer the sacrament of baptism, and bury the dead, and in the province of Nova Scotia we are allowed also to solemnize marriages; we have always enjoyed this privilege in Nova Scotia as all other ministers of the Gospel do there.

Do you know whether the law is different, or whether the construction put upon it is different?—The law is different.

Have there been any disputes with regard to burial-grounds in Canada, between the church of England and the Wesleyan Methodists, as to solemnizing the right of burial, as there have been between the church of England and the Presbyterians?—No, we have not been involved in any such controversy.

You have stated that the Wesleyan Methodists in Canada would be dissatisfied if any portion of the clergy reserves should be applied to the Presbyterians; are you not of opinion that they stand upon a different footing with yourselves seeing that they are one of the churches established and recognized by law?—We know nothing of the Presbyterian church of Scotland as an established church out of Scotland; we view it as a strictly local es-

# 40 Appendix to Report on Religious Grants. [No. 108.]

establishment, and we think that its ministers have no right to enjoy any peculiar privileges in any of his majesty's colonies because they belong to the church of Scotland.

Do you consider it as confined to Scotland?—Yes.

In what light do you view the Presbyterian church that is established in Ireland?—I am aware that there are a few Presbyterian churches established in the north of Ireland, but I am not aware that the Presbyterian church is established in Ireland generally.

Are you aware that at one time they had possession of the tithes in the north of Ireland?—Yes, but they never were in possession of such a privilege in Canada, nor in any of the North American colonies; it would be felt as a grievance if we were to have two ecclesiastical hierarchies endowed in the colonies.

In what way do you suppose that that union would press upon you?—We mean that if the Presbyterian church, as well as the church of England, were to be established and endowed in the colonies, there would be two ecclesiastical establishments in the country which other denominations would be very much dissatisfied with.

You are aware that in case these two establishments were erected they would not be paid out of the taxes up-

on the country?—No, they would not; but the Wesleyan denomination has a much greater number of ministers and of organised churches in Canada than the Presbyterians have, and at least done as much to promote the religious and moral improvement of the people; their loyalty is well known, it is acknowledged in this letter, and has been acknowledged upon various occasions by the different Governors in British North America; and we should be dissatisfied if the Presbyterians were to be placed in more favourable circumstances than we are, as we cannot conceive of any good claim that they have to the enjoyment of any privilege in the colonies to which we are not entitled.

Are there any members of your persuasion in either of the Legislative Assemblies?—There are in the Lower House of Upper Canada; and several of them are in the Commission of the Peace, and hold commissions in the Provincial Militia.

Are any of them either in the Legislative or the Executive Councils?—I believe not.

Are there any Presbyterians in either Council?—I do not know;—I should wish to state, that we consider ourselves as a branch of the church of England, both at home and abroad.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Articles of Union .....	27	of Missions (London) .....	31
Doctor Townley's Letter.....	28	Letter from Col. Rowan .....	28
Evidence of Rev. E. Evans.....	6	Do. to Dr. Townley, from Pro't. & Sec'y	
Ditto ditto .....	ib	of Missionary board of U. C.....	29
Ditto of Rev. J. Richardson .....	11	Letter from the Secretaries of the Wesley-	
Ditto of Rev. W. Case .....	16	an Missionary Society London...	30
Ditto of Mr. Thomas Vaux.....	19	Do from Rev. Robert Alder to Rev. J.	
Ditto of Rev. J. Richardson .....	20	Ryerson .....	ib.
Ditto of Rev. D. Culp .....	22	Do from the President and Secretary of	
Ditto of Mr. J. R. Armstrong.....	ib.	the Wesleyan Missionary board of	
Ditto of Rev. E. Evans.....	23	Upper Canada, to the Secretaries	
Ditto of Rev. J. Richardson .....	24	of the London Wesleyan Missio-	
Ditto of John Willson, Esq.....	ib.	nary Committee .....	32
Ditto of Rev. Jos. Stinson.....	25	Resolutions passed on the subject of Doctor	
Ditto of Rev. J. Flanagan.....	26	Townley's Letter.....	28
Ditto of Rev. Robert Alder, before Com-		Ditto of the board of Missions of the	
mittee of House of Commons in		U. C. Conference .....	30
England.....	38	Treasurer's Accounts .....	32
Extract from Minutes of Com'tee (London)	29		
Do. from proceedings of Wesleyan Board			